



A WORKER LOOKS AT HISTORY



By MARK STARR



PLEBS



A WORKER LOOKS AT HISTORY

800

7388

Marie Wilson



A WORKER LOOKS AT HISTORY

*Being Outlines of Industrial History specially
written for Labour College-Plebs Classes*



By MARK STARR
(S.W.M.F.)

With a Foreword by
GEORGE BARKER
(Miners' Agent, Abertillery, Mon.)

THIRD EDITION



Published by
THE PLEBS LEAGUE, 11a PENYWERN
ROAD, EARL'S COURT, LONDON, S.W.5

1919



A FOREWORD

THIS little book will be welcomed by the many students of the Labour College Classes, and the thousands of intelligent young workers who are seeking knowledge of Industrial History.

The enlightenment the worker needs is coming to him, and coming much quicker than is generally discerned. It is coming not from class-biassed University professors, but from men of his own industrial organisation. The industrial worker of the coming generation will be intellectually equipped, not for "Collective Bargaining" with his employer, but for taking over and controlling his own industry.

Our author has well qualified himself for the work he has undertaken. He has specialised on his subject, he is a teacher of Industrial History in the Labour College Classes in his own locality. He therefore knows what information the worker needs, and has provided it. These classes, Mr. *Times* Man, are producing the "Ferment of Revolution" you so much dread—a revolution of the most fearsome type for the Capitalist and the Bureaucrat; a revolution from ignorance to knowledge—the most potent form of revolution conceivable. This change is taking place right under our very eyes; *silent*, yet the most powerful in history. This book will hasten it. As one of the Old Guard to one of the New, I wish his venture good speed, and congratulate the author on his successful achievement.

GEORGE BARKER,

Miners' Agent, Abertillery, Mon.

22nd October, 1917.

AUTHOR'S PREFACE

THESE Outlines would never have been written but for the fact that the writer, in the autumn of 1915, was fortunate enough to come into contact with the then Central Labour College and the Plebs League, through being awarded a scholarship tenable at the C.L.C., by the Rhondda No. 1 District of the S.W.M.F. Then, for the first time, he saw the need of Independence in Working-Class Education, and the immense potentialities it possessed for those members of his class who, like himself, were sound at heart yet muddled in head; lacking in knowledge of things as they are, and awaiting "the delivering power" of clear thinking and the new idea in order to secure the surest, quickest way of advance.

After an all too short and somewhat disturbed stay at the College, circumstances forced a return to work in August, 1916. The Aberdare Miners' District took up the provision of classes in Social Science, and the teaching of the Industrial History classes became part of my work. The suggestion was made to the *Merthyr Pioneer* that it should publish Outlines of the lessons given, in order to help the class students and others unable to attend; and to persuade outsiders of the benefits to be gained by the workers taking up the study of Industrial History from a definite working-class viewpoint. The kind consent of the Editor enabled us to follow the example set by the *Railway Review* and the London District Council of the N.U.R., in the case of W. W. Craik's articles. The Outlines served their purpose; general appreciation was expressed, and they even attracted the notice of a *Times* Special Correspondent (22/11/16).

To attempt full acknowledgement of all sources of information would be too large a task. Readers of Kerr & Co.'s publications will doubtless recognise information and ideas which have unconsciously become my own. The Bibliography might well be doubled, but the books mentioned have been selected with the limited money, time, and energy of the

worker in view; and they include, in connection with some of the Outlines, works of fiction which contain interesting sidelights upon certain periods, and which may be read when the work-tired brain is unattracted by the text-books proper; though it is hoped these latter will be consulted also, as an Outline is only suggestive and needs filling in.

I am also indebted to W. W. Craik's unpublished Lectures-by-Post, and to his series of articles in the *Railway Review*—since republished, though (regrettably) condensed, in book-form;* as well as to his oral instruction for much of the information, method of presentation, and illustrations used in these Outlines. The worth of the Sub-Warden of the Labour College to the working-class movement—and that of many other past and present scientific Socialists who have freely given their brains, and lived laborious nights and days for their fellows—has not yet been fully recognised. (Not that such individuals are anxious for any such recognition, believing as they do that the movement, not the man, is what matters, and that—“Never mind who gets the credit so long as the work is done.”)

Those students who kept cuttings of the original Outlines will notice alterations in their present form. Expansion of the earlier and some condensation of the later chapters has been attempted for reasons of proportion. This was made easier, and also necessary, because, when the Outlines were appearing, W. W. Craik's above-mentioned book had not been published. In preference to omitting the Outlines partially covered by his book, and thus breaking the continuity of the lessons, an effort has been made to deal here with certain points only briefly dealt with by him. The two books should, therefore, be read together when the later Outlines are being taken in the classes which this book endeavours to serve. The alternative

* *A Short History of the Modern British Working-Class Movement*. 1s. 6d. Plebs League, 11A Penywern Road, Earl's Court, London, S.W.5.)

groupings of the periods of Trade Union history need not prevent this; and the unanswerable case for Industry Unionism and its history, given in thirty pages of Craik's book, makes further emphasis superfluous in these Outlines.

Written by a wage-worker for the use of other wage-workers, by one alternately using a mandrill and a pen, these Outlines were composed in week-ends, evenings, and other intervals snatched from the time occupied by classwork, and the getting of a living "by helping to milk the black cow." While the disadvantages of such conditions are obvious, yet they have had their compensations in keeping the writer close to the objective world of reality, often ignored by college professors, which will have to be faced and altered by the workers before they have the sufficiency of means, time, and energy to demand for themselves books giving a more adequate treatment of the history of the Labour-process.

Before the science of navigation was developed, the compass used, and continents and currents discovered, the early mariners could only sail within sight of the little land they knew. Before a clear knowledge of social science, leading on to a conscious control of social forces, was sought and found, we of a newer day in the Labour Movement (without disparaging any of the work of our fellows and their leaders in the past) feel that they, too, were forced to sail only in sight of the well-known lands of their limited experience, and to steer by rule of thumb and precedent. But when the science of society is developed, when we have the compass of working-class education, and when we have estimated the strength of the currents and mapped out the social world, then, in the same way, we as mariners of the organised Labour ship will be able to launch out across hitherto uncharted oceans and explore new worlds, where the workers will control the conditions of their life, and wage-slavery be but a memory. The purpose of this book is to aid the rapidly growing working-class movement, which

gives fair promise to provide society with a chart and steering skill for future voyages.

My thanks are due to J. F. Horrabin for much advice regarding necessary re-drafting, and also to the same friend for correction of proofs; and to the Editor of the *Merthyr Pioneer* for permission to reprint.

November, 1917.

MARK STARR.

PREFACE TO 3RD EDITION

The exhaustion of the two former editions and the demand for a reprint, gives me an opportunity to make many small improvements and corrections in this manual. That memorable passage in which the basis of Marx's theory of history is formulated is reproduced in full. Expansion has been made in the Outlines, the formerly omitted Outline XIX. is included, and an Epilogue and Index have been added. In many ways, the value of the book has been increased.

Little appeared by way of criticism in the Press reviews of the earlier editions which needs a reply. Naturally, the old charge that the M.C.H. was "too narrow" reappeared once or twice.

This book, in an improved form, is sent forth on its third journey in the hope that again it will be of some assistance to individual students and classes anxious to acquire that light and leading, that knowledge and encouragement which our educational movement supplies to the working class.

Mr. G. Sims, the secretary of the Labour College, has given invaluable suggestions in regard to improvements in the matter and form of this edition.

October, 1919.

M. S.

SYLLABUS

THE following Syllabus of the classes in English Industrial History, conducted by the author in the Aberdare District (S. Wales Miners' Federation), may—besides serving as a Summary of the Contents of this book—be useful to other classes printing similar synopses of courses of study.

TEXT-BOOKS:—*Industrial History of England* (Gibbins), and *History of Modern British Working-Class Movement* (Craik).

1 A GENERAL INTRODUCTION.—The scope of Industrial History. Benefits obtained from its study. Theory: What it is, its use and test. Various historical theories: Theistic; The Great Man Theory; The Climate, Food and Soil Theory; and the Economic Theory or Materialist Conception, outlined by Marx in the preface to his *Critique of Political Economy*.

2 AN INTRODUCTION TO ENGLISH INDUSTRIAL HISTORY.—The relativity of all beginnings. The evidence of Geology. Early traces of Man. The Ice Age. The evidence of Ethnology and Archæology concerning the slow advance. Their different methods of classification based upon the Labour process. The chief sources of information. Probable origin of the Celts. The coming of the Romans (55 B.C.). Its effects.

3 FROM MARK TO MANOR.—The evidence of the existence of the Mark. Parallel examples of communism in other lands. The various Invasions of Great Britain. The Anglo-Saxon Manor. Its method of land ownership and cultivation. The evolution of the chief, soldier and priest.

4 FEUDALISM.—How it arose. The division between the farmer and the fighter. Its re-organisation in England by the Normans. The Hierarchy in Church and State. The land basis of society. The information furnished by the Domesday Book.

5 THE SLAVE, THE SERF, AND THE MODERN WAGE-

WORKER.—Chattel Slavery: Its origin and history. A comparison of their lot.

6 TOWNS AND TRADE IN THE MIDDLE AGES.—How towns originated in markets, fairs and shrines. The decay of the self-sufficing community. The growth of Luxury. Early traders. The increasing use of money and its consequences.

7 THE GUILDS.—Their origin. Differing Types. Merchant Guilds. Exclusive control of Craft Guild over production. The Guild-worker's status. The strife between town and country.

8 THE FALL OF FEUDALISM.—Commutation of labour rents. Effects of internal and external wars. The Crusades. Castles and Gunpowder. The Black Death. The Peasants' Revolt. The subsequent Temporary Golden Age of Labour.

9 THE RISE OF THE MERCHANT CLASS.—Early Merchants. The 16th century growth of foreign trade. The English wool. Rivalry between national merchants under the Tudors. The merchants and the guilds. Mercantile economy and the precious metals. The methods of accumulation of wealth.

10 THE RENAISSANCE FROM MEDIÆVAL NIGHT.—Examples of mediæval superstition. The new inductive method of Bacon and others. Printing and the revival of learning. The economic causes behind the awakening.

11 THE CREATION OF THE PROLETARIAT.—Enclosures for sheep-farming. The divorce from the means of production. Vagrancy and the Poor Law. The rise of the manufactory.

12 THE BEGINNINGS OF MODERN CAPITALISM.—Its general nature and other systems of production. Its various stages up to the Industrial Revolution. The fight for markets. Division of labour inside workshop. Its philosophy as expressed by Adam Smith.

13 THE POLITICAL STRUGGLE.—The right of taxation. The Revolution culminating in 1688. Uses of political power. Further progress until 1832.

14 THE BEGINNINGS OF TRADE UNIONS.—Comparison with other labour associations made. Their battle for a legal existence. Their structure and policy outlined from 1700 to the time of Robert Owen.

15 THE INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION.—From the tool to the machine. The gradual destruction of handicraft. The three stages of Power. Manufacture becomes Machinofacture. Inventions and sources of Power discoveries. Developments in textile, mining and transport industries. How England out-distanced her competitors.

16 THE INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION AND THE WORKERS.—Early horrors. The Factory legislation. The new industrial centres. The Chartist movement. The Repeal of the Corn Laws. The succeeding "grand era of capitalist expansion."

17 TRADE UNIONISM FROM 1830 TO 1900.—Attempts at Federation. Its revolutionary hopes. The building of stable organisations after 1850. Structure and bargaining policy of the Model Unions. The New Unionism of 1880. Propaganda bodies and their influence.

18 THE TRADE UNIONS FROM 1900-1914.—Formation of a political Party and its activity. The Labour Unrest and its causes. The present position; and modern methods of organisation, structure and policy.

19 THE THREE PERIODS OF CAPITALISM.—(1) The First Warlike Period; (2) The Manchester Peaceful Period; (3) The Imperialistic Second Warlike Period. Their effects upon the worker.

20 IN CONCLUSION: A SUMMARY.—The logic of the machine. The effects of woman's increasing entrance into industry. Modern Movements. The need for working-class education in Scientific Socialism. A forecast of the future.

READING NOTE TO 3RD EDITION:

In the enlarged book lists Gibbins' *Industrial History of England* (Methuen, 5s.), Townsend Warner's *Landmarks in Industrial History* (Blackie, 5s.) and Craik's *Short History of the Modern British Working-Class Movement* will be referred to as Gibbins, Warners and Craiks. When pages of *Capital*, Vol. I. (8s. 6d., Plebs League), are given they are those of the English edition, to which must be added 40, increasing to 48, for the Kerr American edition. The more costly books will be found in most public libraries and alternative books have been given on the chance that the student may possess one, if not the others, mentioned.

In most cases the Plebs League can supply the books listed. For address see front page.

I.—A GENERAL INTRODUCTION

INDUSTRIAL History deals with the history of the Labour Process. Therefore we workers, by studying it, learn how, under various systems of society, the Labour Process was carried on. Too long we have been stuffed with "drum-and-trumpet history, Royal amours, Court intrigues, the romping of armies over the Continent," and the like. Shoving aside this superficial shoddy we wish to find out the status and conditions of the workers of other times. And we do this, not because of any love for the antique, but because, wishing to raise our class, we wish to learn how other classes found the road to power; looking backward to understand the present, and in order to march forward.

THEORY AND PRACTICE.—"Man makes his own history," that is agreed; but when we come to discuss "how he made and makes it," then various conflicting theories or explanations are offered. Before dealing with the chief of these explanations, it is necessary thoroughly to understand what a theory is, what its use, and what its test. To listen to most people, one would think that theory and practice lived in worlds apart, and were in violent contrast to each other; whereas, in truth, theory and practice are inseparable. Perhaps the hypothesis (*i.e.*, the advanced, partly proved theory) is too often confused with theories about which no doubts exist—*e.g.*, Water is wet. The purely practical man is as impossible as the purely theoretical. To theorise is to generalise experiences—*e.g.*, the theory that "water puts out fire" has been inductively gathered or generalised from experiences when water did quench fire. Facts and ideas are inseparable in reality. No sequence of facts or ideas can be given without unconsciously giving an explanation. Without theory history is but a mass of meaningless detail. Theories are indispensable mental tools. Thus we all theorise, but the trouble is that we do not theorise *consciously*. The nature of the thinking process and of thought is not understood. In the everyday

things of life, all people perforce act upon the inductive reasoning of themselves or of others. The natural scientists by means of their telescopes, their delicate balances, and their test-tubes experiment and ceaselessly observe facts *before* they attempt to form hypothesis and theory. But often these very men, in other spheres of thought, when dealing with ethics, morals, religions and other social matters forget their former method. They vainly attempt to cudgel truth out of the mind itself. To enable the worker to gain a true knowledge of the hard facts of life, to aid him consciously to generalise his theory therefrom, and then to act in accordance with the theory thus gained—these are the aims and uses of education.

Now, every person has an experience of his own which he cannot share with any other person. Theory, however, is different, for it can be shared and the advantage of theory is that it saves the repetition of experience. Our mothers gave us the theory that "fire burns fingers"; this saved us from finding this out for ourselves. Of course, if we wished to prove the theory, the fire was always handy. Theories, then, save us time and trouble, and they can be conveyed to other persons by teaching, oral or otherwise. Only centuries of stored accumulated theories give modern man his superiority over the animal and the savage.

Another use of theory is that by it we can forecast our future experience. I can say with indubitable certainty that if I put my fingers in the fire in 1925 I shall receive a burn. So, theory is a guide to practice, and it is important that we should get true pictures of all the facts and draw from them correct theories. He who would attempt to disown theory as a guide to action would be as foolish as a man who, in building a house, refuses to learn anything from the experiences of others in the material to be used, refuses to build to a plan, or as one who would start a mine without first getting the necessary information from the geologist.

The test of the truth of a theory is "Will it explain the facts?" If we ever come across a kind of fire which

did not burn fingers, our theory that fire did burn fingers would be proved untrue, and would have to go. *The theory may be wrong, the facts never.* And it will help us to get true theories if we remember that the world is continually changing and constantly demanding that we should revise our theories and bring them "up to date." It will be interesting to apply this test to the historical theories with which we will now deal.

1 THE THEISTIC CONCEPTION OF HISTORY.—History, under this theory or conception, was thought to be the work of a supernatural power which controlled and governed all men. Every nation has its gods, pixies, goblins, fairies, etc., which protect or afflict it. Monotheism is a later development. But a close study of religion reveals that it is the changed and not the changer. When a nomadic people adopt a settled life, then they need new gods. Before, they needed a portable god; in settled life they build temples. We need not examine in this Outline this theory at length. It certainly is not "up to date." No educated person, for example, will ascribe the recent European War to the doings of a supernatural power. "The stage of History is not a Punch and Judy show." A conception which has been discarded in the explanation of the making of the earth and the development of its inhabitants cannot be honestly retained to explain the social relations of men. In fact, the more clearly those relations are understood the more quickly supernatural religion dissolves. Even now the thinking wage-worker is leaving behind him the former attempts of man to emotionally and intellectually relate himself to a Universe once thought to be mysteriously unexplainable.

2 THE GREAT MAN THEORY.—The supernatural theory having failed to explain the facts, the theory that history was the record of the doings of great men was made—the "hero" was trotted out as the dynamic of progress. Carlyle's name is prominent in connection with this gospel of "hero-worship." But, alas,

the greatness of all Carlyle's heroes can be explained by the material conditions of their times. Luther only moved when Indulgences were sold in his own parish, and if he had lived 10 years earlier he would have been the central performer in a heated controversy at the stake in the market-place—another "burning question" would have been settled. "Men are the creatures and not the creators of their age." And what applies to Luther applies also to other great men—to the Cromwells, the Napoleons, and Kaisers of history—even to modern "captains" of industry. It has been proved again and again that the well-known examples of inventive genius but carried a small step forward the idea or the invention of a multitude of unnamed predecessors. No one can deny the truth written by Spencer. ". . . He [the great man of any sort] is powerless in the absence of the material and mental accumulations which his society inherits from the past, and that he is powerless in the absence of the co-existing population, character, intelligence and social arrangements. Given a Shakespeare and what dramas could he have written without the multitudinous traditions of civilised life—without the various experiences, which, descending to him from the past, gave wealth to his thought, and without the language which a hundred generations had developed and enriched by use? Suppose a Watt, with all his inventive power, living in a tribe ignorant of iron, or in a tribe that could only get as much iron as a fire blown by hand-bellows will smelt; or suppose him born among ourselves before lathes existed; what chance would there have been of the steam engine?" "No man is so great as to merit deification. No man is so commonplace as to merit damnation." Even the greatest personality fails if he battles to retain that which evolutionary forces have made obsolete. "He who labours in harmony with evolution, him we may modestly call 'great.' Let us all be great. . . ." We suggest that this theory will not stand the test. History is not explained by great personalities.

3 THE CLIMATE, FOOD, AND SOIL THEORY.—This theory cannot be understood apart from the time in which it was made—the middle of the 19th century. The general principles of evolution were being proved by their individual application to biology. Law and order were being introduced into the other sciences. Many were the various idealist theories applied to history. In opposition to these idealists, who thought that material changes were caused by changes in ideas, arose other thinkers, who maintained the opposite view—*i.e.*, that ideas arose from, and were governed by, material conditions.

Buckle was one of these latter thinkers, and in his *History of Civilisation* (Vol. I, Chapter 2) he wrote that the character of a people or a society was determined by the climate, food, soil, geographical position, etc., of the country in which it lived. This theory seems to explain the facts. A desert land would breed a race of nomads; an island people would become a mercantile nation; a hilly country would produce bands of raiders; civilisation would first spring up where Nature was kind and genial, and where food was procured easily. These and many other very interesting examples he adduces to prove his theory. Undoubtedly in the infancy of the race natural environment largely influenced society. But the theory fails to explain the more recent development of society—*e.g.*, in England Buckle's factors have remained unchanged since the Romans, and yet vast developments have taken place; and so, applying our test, we find that this theory does not explain the facts. Factors which do not change cannot cause change. We will now pass on to deal with the theory outlined by Marx and Engels (Engels, however, gives Marx the chief credit), which succeeded in explaining the complexity of history.

THE MATERIALISTIC CONCEPTION OF HISTORY.—This theory of history shows that the change which precedes all changes in the superstructure of society, in politics, morals, laws, religions, etc., is a change in

the economic foundations of society, "the means and methods of wealth production and distribution."

The following full statement will be found in the Preface to Marx's *Critique of Political Economy*, published 1859:—

The first work which I undertook for the purpose of solving the doubts which perplexed me was a critical re-examination of Hegel's Philosophy of Law. The introduction to this work appeared in the German-French Year Books, published at Paris in 1844. My investigation ended in the conviction that legal relations and forms of government cannot be explained either by themselves or by the so-called development of the human mind, but, on the contrary, have their roots in the conditions of men's physical existence, whose totality Hegel, following the English and French writers of the 18th century, summed up under the name of civic society; and that the anatomy of civic society must be sought in political economy, to which study I next gave my attention.

The general result which I arrived at and which, once obtained, served as a guide for my subsequent studies, can be briefly formulated as follows:—

In making their livelihood together men enter into certain necessary involuntary relations with each other.

These industrial relations arise out of their respective conditions and occupations and correspond to whatever stage society has reached in the development of its material productive forces.

Different stages of industry produce different relations.

The totality of these industrial relations constitutes the economic structure and basis of society.

Upon this basis the legal and political super-structure is built.

There are certain forms of social consciousness or so-called public opinion which correspond to this basis.

The method prevailing in any society of producing the material livelihood determines the social, political, and intellectual life of men in general.

It is not primarily men's consciousness which determines their mode of life; on the contrary, it is their social life which determines their consciousness.

When the material productive forces of society have advanced to a certain stage of their development they come into opposition with the old conditions of production, or, to use a

legal expression, with the old property relations, under which these forces have hitherto been exerted.

Instead of scriving longer as institutions for the development of the productive powers of society, these antiquated property relations now become hindrances. Then begins an epoch of social revolution.

With the change of the economic basis the whole vast super-structure undergoes, sooner or later, a revolution.

In considering such revolutions we must always distinguish clearly between the change in the industrial methods of social production on the one hand; this change takes place unconsciously, strictly according to the laws of natural science, and might properly be called an evolution.

And, on the other hand, the change in the legal, political, religious, artistical or philosophical, in short, ideological, institutions; with reference to these men fight out this conflict as a revolution conscious of their opposing interests.

This conflict takes the form of a class struggle.

As little as we judge an individual by what he himself thinks he is, just as little can we judge such a revolutionary epoch by its own consciousness.

We must rather explain this consciousness out of the antagonisms of men's industrial occupations, out of the conflict existing between the productive capacity of social industry and the legal institutions under which this industry is carried on.

A society, no matter what its form may be, is never broken up until all the productive powers are developed for which it is adapted.

New and higher social institutions are never established until the material conditions of life to support them have been prepared in the lap of the old society itself.

Therefore, mankind never sets for itself any tasks except those for which it has received the proper training and which it is able to perform.

If we examine closely, it will always be found that the conflict itself never arises except where the material conditions of its solution are already at hand, or at least are in the process of growth.

We may in wide outlines characterise the Asiatic, the antique, the feudal and the modern capitalistic methods of production as a series of progressive epochs in the evolution of economic society.

The industrial relations arising out of the capitalist method of production constitute the last of the antagonistic forms of

social production; antagonistic not in the sense of an antagonism between individuals, but of an antagonism growing out of the circumstances in which men must live who take part in social production.

But the productive forces which are developed in the lap of capitalist society create at the same time the material conditions needed for the abolition of this antagonism. The capitalist form of society, therefore, will bring to a close this cycle of the history of human society, as it has existed under the various forms of exploitation.*

It is only the workers who dare accept this theory of history, for the evolutionary forces are now on our side. Capitalism, having solved the problem of production, is now a fetter, and it has brought into existence its own grave-diggers. This theory is the tool which we shall consciously apply in our industrial history studies, and not only will it help us to explain past history, but it will enable us to make it in the future.

The following pamphlets will furnish interesting light upon this conception of history:—

Socialism: Utopian and Scientific (Engels). 1s. 6d. S.L.P.

The Communist Manifesto (Marx and Engels). 3d. S.L.P.

BOOKS:

Ethics and the Materialist Conception of History (Kautsky).
2s. 6d.

Critique of Political Economy (Marx) and
Positive Outcome of Philosophy (Dietzgen). Kerr and Co.
5s. each.

*From Alcy's *Socialism and Evolution*. S.L.P. 1d.

II.—INTRODUCTION TO THE INDUSTRIAL HISTORY OF ENGLAND

WE propose next to briefly survey the pre-historic period down to the coming of the Romans, at which time the written history of our country begins. Thus we shall secure a foundation in pre-historic times for all later developments.

Before proceeding to do this, however, it will be well to give a summarising definition of that theory, or mental tool, which we are going carefully and conscientiously to use throughout our lessons. Here is a short definition:—

“The materialistic conception of history is that view of history which ascribes the driving power of all social change to the economic development of society in production, distribution, and exchange, with its creation of classes and the resulting class-struggle.”

In this explanation of history the mode of production and exchange is taken as *the basis* of all social relations, and, therefore, private ownership of land and capital being general in historical times, all history is made up of contests between slave and slave owner, capitalist and feudal-lord, and wage-slave and capitalist. History, then, is a record of class-struggles, and these struggles occur over the ownership of the means of production and distribution. When man was in a savage state (*i.e.*, when he had not developed his tools) his ideas, like his tools, were crude. He worshipped the sun and other physical phenomena because, as yet, the natural laws behind these things were undiscovered. When he understood, he no longer worshipped or sacrificed to the sun-god, with its warm and shining face. With the beginning of tools, man interposed between himself and the natural world something which had infinite results, for in changing external nature man changed himself. The early sailor and the modern factory hand are very different in their mental

outlook. One was often superstitious; the other is not. That is because the sailor came into contact with Nature under conditions which have not yet been fully understood and controlled. The sudden storm, the vast expanse of waters, the great waves and winds buffeting him at their will, determined his ideas. In the factory the means of production—the material conditions—have been more developed. The natural forces have been harnessed, and the wheels start and stop at the wish of the master. Reflection furnishes other examples of how man's ideas are determined by his existence.

THE RELATIVITY OF BEGINNINGS.—Before dealing with the divisions of pre-historic and historic times we should clearly understand that beneath all the divisions there is a vital interconnection. The Evolution idea, *i.e.*, "Nothing is—everything is becoming," should help us to understand how period merges into period. "Nature knows no leaps." Night gradually becomes day. The discovered missing links reveal how slowly man himself has evolved. We cannot share the view of Dr. Lightfoot, Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge University, who, in the 17th century, computed that "man was created by the Trinity on the 23rd of October, 4004 B.C., at nine o'clock in the morning." So right throughout our studies, when dealing with different systems and movements, let us remember that they slowly evolved as the conditions suitable for their existence ripened. But let us also remember that the often slow evolution does culminate in revolution; the day of Capitalism is fundamentally different from the night of Feudalism.

THREE EPOCHS OF TIME.—Time has been divided into three periods. The following method of division is used by Ablett in his *Easy Outlines of Economics*:—

I THE GEOLOGICAL PERIOD OR INORGANIC PERIOD.
—In this period the development from the nebulous whirl to the earth, as we now know it, took place. Changes were caused by the elements struggling together. The estimate of Lyell gives at least 200 millions

of years to this period. *The Making of the Earth*, by Gregory,* is a book giving some very interesting information about development in this period. On a clear star-light night, we all can turn our eyes skywards and see worlds in the making. It is possible "mentally" to separate man from the earth, but the earth is the indispensable premise of all life. Life itself has been described as differentiated matter, and there are some things, crystals for example, which are missing links between the inorganic and the organic divisions, which are difficult to define or to place in either category.

2 THE BIOLOGIC PERIOD.—In this period the amœba became man. Life, which is never seen or felt apart from matter, commenced; and the period finishes with the commencement of society. Struggle again takes place in this period—a struggle for subsistence, not only between different species, but also between individuals of the same species. The fittest to the environment of course survived. Now this fitness is determined by the "physiological" differences of the animals. If the land sunk below sea-level, then the water animal would survive. If the land arose, then the land animal would be triumphant, because it had the necessary limbs, covering, and organs necessary for land existence. If the change was slow and the organism not too complex, gradual adaptation to environment was possible. The huge fossils we see in our museums are the remains of those who failed to survive. Animals may use, but never make, tools.

3 THE SOCIOLOGICAL OR ECONOMIC PERIOD.—The cleavage between this period and the second period plays havoc with, and renders invalid, all those analogies and arguments which certain writers are so fond of using. Society cannot be considered as an "organism" in the biological sense of the word. The difference between men is not a physiological but an "economic" one. Kings and scavengers are born alike, and, indeed, with a little training, the former could do the latter's work. Man is the tool-making animal.

* *Home University Library*. 23.

The difference between a navvy and a clerk is not like that between two different animals, but results from the different tools they use. We noted struggle in the preceding periods. Now in this division we get the "struggle between classes"; the class which owns the tools or has discovered new means of production. This importance of technique is clearly shown by other methods of classification, though the users of those methods, while recognising the consequences of the use of new tools in the past, are often conveniently blind to the consequences, not of tool-using, but of tool-ownership in the present. Before dealing with them, we may remark that the chief sources of our information about pre-historic times are:—

(1) A study of contemporary peoples still in a barbaric state—*e.g.*, the Tasmanians who, when discovered by travellers, had a great difficulty in kindling a fire, and whose limited vocabulary needed the aid of gesture and facial expression so much that they could not converse with each other in the dark. Reference might be made to the travels and investigations of Baldwin Spencer and Gillen among the South Australian aborigines, and of others in Bengal Ceylon, Inner Africa, Borneo, Brazil, Greenland and Labrador.

(2) The findings of Archæology—*i.e.*, that science which discovers and studies ancient remains. Human skulls and bones, ancient tools, utensils and dwellings are amongst its finds. Many and strange were the explanations for these flints and tools before this science furnished a natural one. Sometimes these "pixies' hammers" were connected with the fairies or it was thought that they had been used to hasten the exit of Mephistopheles from the heavenly quarters. They were also confused with meteorites.

THE ARCHÆOLOGICAL CLASSIFICATION.—This classification is as follows:—(1) The Old Stone Age, when unsharpened flints were used; (2) The New Stone Age, when the flints were sharpened; (3) The

Bronze Age; and (4) The Iron Age, when man is on the threshold of civilisation.

THE ETHNOLOGICAL CLASSIFICATION.—The science of Ethnology (which treats of racial diversities and characteristics) has supplied another classification which is also based upon technical progress. Lewis H. Morgan, whose best work, *Ancient Society*, has been epitomised by Engels in his *Origin of the Family*, divides up human development thus:—(1) Savagery; (2) Barbarism; and (3) Civilisation. The first two periods he sub-divides into Lower, Middle, and Upper Stages. His conclusions were based upon life-long investigations. In the Lower Stage of Savagery the race was in its gibbering infancy, "with foreheads villainously low," and very different from that "noble piece of work" which Hamlet eulogised. The Middle Stage of Savagery, he says, was reached with the discovery of the use of fire. It does not need a very fertile imagination to realise what this discovery meant to early man in the way of warmth in colder climates; in protection from animal foes, and in cooking his food. In Greek mythology Prometheus stole fire from the gods in heaven for man's use. The Upper Stage of Savagery was reached with the utilisation of the bow and arrow, which would be of great use in hunting and fighting. Savagery saw also promiscuity in sexual intercourse make way for various family forms.

The Lower Stage of Barbarism was arrived at with the making and use of pottery. It is interesting to notice how man's power over his environment grows. When he had vessels he could store his food and drink and live farther away from where they were procured. The Middle Age of Barbarism was reached with the taming and tending of animals and the beginnings of agriculture. Jenks, in Chapter iv. of *History of Politics*, very plausibly suggests how the domestic animals originated from pets—the young of the captured animals. Man now had a surer supply of milk and meat than in his hunting days. Agriculture—perhaps commencing in an accidental growth of surplus seeds

gathered for eating but left in a rubbish heap—again, would gradually lead to settled life. The Upper Stage of Barbarism comes with the utilisation of iron, which has continued up to our own Iron and Steel Age.

Civilisation comes in with the discovery of the art of writing, this probably evolving from picture-writing. Longfellow, in *Hiawatha*, gives in a poetic form the old Indian legends of how their great chief, among the other benefits he bestowed upon his people, discovered picture-writing.

ENGLAND'S EARLIEST INHABITANTS.—Some traces of Paleolithic man, who lived in the Old Stone Age, have been found here. This division is divided into two—the River Drift Age, when man lived chiefly in the open; and the later Paleolithic, when he sheltered in caves. "By the time Neolithic man appeared, England had assumed the features of its climate and insular position, which is characteristic of England to-day. One hundred thousand years is a moderate estimate of the time since the beginning of the Neolithic Age."

THE COMING OF THE CELTS.—This race is a branch of the Aryan stock, which is supposed to have come west about 4,500 years ago. The Teutons, Greeks, and Latins belong to the same stock. The Celts dispersed the older inhabitants and settled in tribes in England. Here they were found in a state of barbarism by the Romans in 55 B.C. Next we shall deal with the effects of the Roman invasion and occupation of Britain.

READING:

Marx's *18th Brumaire* (Kerr, 2s. 6d.), for the M.C.H. in application.

For Evolution:

Hurley's *Man's Place in Nature* (Dent) 2s.,

Hird's *Easy Outlines of Evolution* (1s.) and

Picture Book of Evolution (Watts, 12s. 6d.).

For a very fine comparison of findings of Darwin and Marx:

Marxism and Darwinism, by Pannekoek. (Kerr and Co., 6d.)

Other collateral reading:

Paul's *The State*. (S.L.P. 3s. 6d.), especially earlier chapters.

Origin of Family (2s. 6d.) and

Ancient Society. (Kerr and Co., 7s.)

III.—FROM MARK TO MANOR

OUR last Outline brought us to the time when the written records of British history begin. The present Outline will cover in a very brief survey that lengthy period of development down to about the year 1000 A.D., in which period the Roman and Anglo-Saxon occupations occurred.

When found by the Romans (55 B.C.) the Celts had metal weapons, domestic animals, a rude agriculture carried on chiefly in Kent and Sussex, and tin mines in Cornwall, with which the Greek and Phœnician merchants traded, bringing in exchange bronze, earthenware, and salt.

EFFECTS OF ROMAN OCCUPATION.—Though Julius Cæsar invaded Britain in 55 B.C., a permanent settlement was not made by the Romans till about one hundred years later. They abandoned Britain in 410 A.D. The chief effects were:—

(1) The British rudimentary industries were developed and organised, agriculture especially being raised to a higher level. (2) Houses and towns were made. There are records of 59 cities by the year 250. A.D. (3) Roads were made, linking the fort-cities together for military purposes. (4) Trade was encouraged. Corn, cattle, hides, dogs, metals, pearls, oysters, jet and slaves were exported; while the imports were chiefly salt, wine, ivory, and amber ornaments, the finer cloths and other luxuries. (5) The Roman language, dress habits, etc., were introduced.

CHARACTER OF THE ROMAN OCCUPATION.—The Roman occupation was essentially a military one, based upon their superior military development and discipline. Even in Wales the well-organised legions, the Roman roads, the great camps, and the stone-built villas were established. The Romans, in coming to Britain, were not prompted by altruism. "The conquest was followed by the exploitation of the con-

quered." The Romans drained the world of vegetable and mineral wealth and of the manufactured goods then existing. Conquests had to be made to meet the insatiable demands of a military state. The developments which they fostered and encouraged in tool-making, rough weaving and dyeing, in mining, and boat and house building were prompted by a desire for a large revenue. Heavy taxes were laid upon the Britons. Huge levies of wheat—to feed Rome's rabble—and of men—to be slaves and soldiers—were enforced. The Roman villa of the conqueror stood in dangerous contrast to the hovel of the conquered. This exploitation was not suffered in silence, and we read of revolts which the Romans invariably subdued.

It will help to explain the relapse of civilisation which followed the Roman withdrawal if we understand that the Romans kept the weapons of warfare chiefly in their own possession, and that civilisation existed only in town centres, between which intervened the forests and much uncultivated land, interspersed only with the military roads. No effort was made towards British self-government. It does not come within our present subject to deal with the reasons for the Roman withdrawal, and we will pass on to deal with the various invasions which followed, and their effects, before dealing with the development referred to in the heading of this Outline.

EFFECTS OF ANGLO-SAXON OCCUPATION.—The invaders are generally grouped under the term Anglo-Saxon. The economic effects of their coming concern us more than their lineage or their fights with the island's inhabitants or between themselves. Suffice it to say that after a turbulent period of external and internal conflict the unity of England was achieved in the reign of Edgar (958–975).

The chief effects were:—(1) The towns were ravaged and, in some cases, destroyed. (2) Trade and industry declined. This relapse, however, was only temporary, and the student, if he wishes, can trace how gradually trade revived again; how the invasion and

settlement of the Danes stimulated this process; how the self-sufficing Anglo-Saxon village was altered; how barter gave way to the use of coin in the markets and fairs, which often originated near religious shrines; how the market gradually widened with the export of wool and agricultural produce—these are developments which we shall deal with in detail later. (3) Paganism was revived. Among the slaves of Britain doubtless Christianity had been introduced. Space forbids a digression to show how Christianity—at first a slave religion—was adopted by Constantine in A.D. 300 as the official religion of the Empire,* and how, with the break-up of the Roman Empire, the church emerged as the only international organisation. The Saxons were in time converted from their pagan beliefs in Thor, Woden, Eostre, and their other gods. (4) A relapse into a rougher life occurred. Agriculture was practised in a rude fashion. Swine, sheep, and cattle were kept. Many of the Roman roads were broken up, thus preventing intercourse between the villages. And many improvements in clothing and building were lost.

It is a controversial question whether the conquered British were entirely destroyed or driven back into Wales and Cornwall, or whether some of them became slaves to the Saxons. However, the British slave's existence is not necessary to explain the appearance of the serf of Feudalism. We will now endeavour to trace the evolution of this system. Historians now agree that the Normans did not introduce, but only reorganised, the Feudal System of land-holding in England. Before they came the Anglo-Saxon Manor was in existence—a very near approach to Feudalism proper.

THE MARK.—When agriculture was carried on by the Teutonic tribes, to which belonged the Anglo-Saxons, the communal system of wealth production existed. The unit of this system was called the Mark. Engels says this method of kindred grouping was

* See pp. 80 and 81 of Paul's *The State*.

brought from Asia in migration. The word "mark" or "march," which had at first denoted the boundary or division between certain pieces of land, became in time the name of the division of land thus marked off. This Mark or common holding of land was probably at first cultivated and occupied in common by a group of kinsfolk. Sometimes six to twelve daughter villages are found associated in the same Mark. These tribes had no slaves, and there was no person without land, for they all owned communally the means of production—*i.e.*, the land.*

Later, the common land was divided into Fields—further sub-divided into strips, with the object of sharing the good and bad patches. Under this Three Fields System—an advance upon the previous Two Fields System—each family would have strips in one field for wheat or rye, other strips for oats or barley in the second field, while the third lay fallow. The length of the tenure gradually increased; instead of redistribution of the land taking place yearly, it was performed only once in three years, and at longer intervals of six, nine, and so on, until redistribution was entirely omitted and the holding became the permanent possession of the individual family. Historians suggest that private property began in the individual house and the land on which it stood, that being perforce exempt from the re-division. Roman influence and advancements in technique created a desire to retain in the family the improved land.

Originally the Saxon tribes were an association of free communities, owning each their common lands. It is interesting to note the super-structure built upon this economic basis. Each village or township had its

* "For many years past there has been sufficient evidence to warrant the assertion that the oldest discoverable forms of property in land were forms of collective property, and to justify the conjecture that separate property had grown through a series of changes out of collective property or ownership in common."—Sir H. Maine.

Mark-moot, in which the officials, the swine- and bee-herd, the pound-keeper and other similar officers, who administered the affairs of the Mark and carried out the annual redistribution of the arable land, were elected. Higher aggregations were the hundred-moot and the shire-moot. The eldermen carried out the will of the community, which elected them. With common ownership of the means of production every Mark-man possessed economic freedom and equality with each other. Kinship was still strong. The clan was all and its *customs* law, and terrible was the plight of the "kin-shattered man" who, in South Wales, was actually sent adrift on a raft. There was no class war, because there were no classes; private ownership of the means of production had not begun.

Some historians doubt whether the Mark System was introduced into England by the Saxons. But the evidence of the existence of common lands (as late as the years 1760-1867 seven million acres were enclosed by Enclosure Acts), as well as the survival in the older towns of ancient customs—e.g., "the beating of the bounds" or "the riding of the marshes"—should overcome their doubts. No one who has read, for example, the evidence compiled by the Hammonds in the 2-4th chapters of their *Village Labourer*, can doubt as to existence of ancient communal rights of land, pasturage and fuel and as to the fierce opposition put up by the labourers at Otmoor and elsewhere as late as 1832 to retain the remnants of their common privileges. "Add to this the evidence of the historic development of other peoples in Europe and, still further, the observed practice of peoples found living in our own time in other parts of the world, at lower stages of development than ourselves, and there is no escape from the conclusion that 'in the general evolution of mankind, common property precedes separate and private property.' "

THE ANGLO-SAXON MANOR.—Our task is now to show how the Manor evolved from the Mark. It can be easily understood that in the struggle for a new land,

in beating back other would-be occupants, and in fighting out their own internal rivalries, the Anglo-Saxons would find it impossible to settle down to an agricultural life. In early times all the tribesmen went to battle, and they could use both the spade and the sword with equal facility. But in continued warfare this could not be, and soon there arose a division of labour between the farmers and the fighters. One part of the community went to fight, the other stayed at home to till the soil. The nominal protector—the fighter—soon became the overlord of the farmer. In marauding raids he would acquire wealth—*e.g.*, oxen—and these acquisitions made him more powerful than the tiller of the soil. From a temporary war-chief evolved the hereditary ruler, with his chosen bodyguards. Under the chief lord there would be the lords of each manor, who were now in a position to demand the service and produce of the tillers of the soil upon his domain. The sheriff of the shire was now a royal delegate. The best house in the village and the best land became my lord's demesne and residence. The three-field system was still in vogue, and the common pasture, fuel, and fishing rights were only slowly stolen from their original owners. Thus what was at first a voluntary arrangement became in time an accepted permanent state of affairs in which the farmer or tiller of the soil was forced into an inferior position. Under Norman Feudalism the baronial and ecclesiastical hierarchies are seen more clearly, and we have more reliable information about the status and services of the serf. However, we can say that the reason of the development which we have traced from Mark to Manor, was "the need for protection in turbulent times of the cultivator. The baron's castle offered protection against earthly dangers. The monastery—the castle of the ecclesiastics—with its defences in many cases, just as the baron's castle was fortified, was not only a place where men might flee for refuge from the dangers of this world, but also from the dangers in the world to come." So the nominal tem-

porary protector became in time the real permanent ruler of the protected; the association of freemen became a body of people rendering service to the lord of the manor; the Mark-moot was displaced by the Court-leet and democratic rule by autocratic government.

But before dealing fully with these developments here we should pause. It is of interest to Socialists to know of a time when the "class struggle" did not exist; and thus, by tracing the conditions of its birth, we shall be able to understand the conditions under which it will die. The means of production in the Mark were crude and undeveloped, and there is no need to hanker after this past community of pauperism. The intervening years have seen much progress, and we, as workers, must recognise, in the words of Untermann, that—"There is only one sound and indestructible basis for human society—the free labour of free producers on terms of economic equality for all without exception!" We must complete the circle, but on a higher level.

BOOKS:

Gibbins, Period I, Chap. I. and II., and Lafargue's *Evolution of Property*. (Kerr, 2s. 6d.).

Engel's *Socialism: Utopian and Scientific*. S.L.P. 1s. 6d.

Hyndman's *Economics of Socialism* (O.P.). Chap. I. contains a fine appreciation of the benefits of Communism and "the bedrock inventions of humanity" then made.

Very valuable, too, is the 1st Chap. of Paul's *The State*, and 5th Chap. of Jenks' *History of Politics*. (Obtainable only second-hand).

IV.—FEUDALISM

IN the Anglo-Saxon development, as already shown, chattel-slavery seems to have been omitted; the number of slaves or bondmen was always very small. Feudalism arose among other peoples, not only through warfare, but from the impoverishment of the freemen and the unprofitableness of the huge farms worked by slave labour, this latter tendency resulting in manumission and in allowing the slave to buy his liberty. In other cases, freemen would give up their lands to some prominent chief in order to secure his protection and patronage, and, perhaps, become part of his body-guard; or give them to the Church and escape the precariousness of the times by becoming monks. Thus with the growth of big estates would come the need of a system whereby they could be held and worked by the former freemen and the liberated slaves.

Again, the Feudal System could be instituted by conquest. The successful chief would portion out the conquered land among his followers and force the conquered people to become their serfs. Before attempting to describe Norman Feudalism and its structure in England a few remarks upon the history of its introducers will not be out of place.

THE NORTHMEN.—The home-land of the Northmen was Scandinavia. They belonged to the Teutonic branch of the Indo-European stock. In the early days of a people's history we find that its population increases faster than the means of subsistence, a fact to which Malthus drew attention.* This factor, and the pressure of other peoples moving west, caused the

* It may be said in passing that, though this Malthusian theory of population may be true in the early stages of development, it is untrue at the present time, for while the rate of increase of population is declining, the productive forces are being more highly developed than ever, and no mouth or stomach need be empty through scarcity of the means of subsistence. The law of population of primitive systems does not hold good for the capitalist system, which has its own.

Anglo-Saxons to come further west, while another part of the same race moved northwards, and became known as Northmen.

We begin to hear about the doings of the Northmen in the 8th and 9th centuries, and very soon they became the terror of the civilised world. Remembering Buckle's theory, it is interesting to notice how the natural environment determined the character of this people. The sterility of the soil, coupled with abundant opportunities for hunting and fishing afforded by the many woods and rivers, made the Northmen a race of hunters and fishers. The making of clothes, and the little tillage which may have been practised in the more fertile parts of the land, were probably the work of the women. The nomadic hunting life; the familiarity with the sea which fishing, extending farther and farther from the shore, would entail; the development of shipping and of the adventuresome spirit begot by seafaring; the overcrowding at home; and the profits of trading with, and the attraction of the booty of, foreign lands—all these things helped to produce that piratical and trading nation which, in its small ships, 75 feet by 15, sailed the Mediterranean, plundering the towns upon its shores and trading with the Arabs; which made forcible settlements in Britain and France; colonised Iceland and Greenland, and discovered America. Their chief ideal was to be brave—a quality very necessary to their mode of life. Their gods were deified hero-warriors; their heaven a place of heroic conflicts interrupted only by the warriors' feast; their hell (note the contrast with our own) a place of cold and darkness, where those who had not died as happy warriors were destined to go.

The size of the bands of these raiders grew larger. We have noticed how by their influence and settlement on the East Coast of England they stimulated towns and trade. At the commencement of the 10th century a large band, under Rollo, invaded France. Charles the Simple, not being able to drive them away, allowed them a portion of the land, which became the

Northmen's land, or Normandy, and was parcelled out among Rollo and his followers on feudal tenure, which system of tenure was already in existence in France.

THE NORMAN CONQUEST OF ENGLAND.—Taking advantage of the division among the English, and raising an army by promises of plunder, William the Norman carried out the Norman Conquest of 1066. The death of the chief English barons in the fighting and abortive risings which occurred, and his powerful position as leader of a conquering army, placed England entirely in William's hands. Thus he was able completely to re-organise the land-holding system, and to make himself an absolute overlord. In distributing the land among his followers he tried to prevent the lords from becoming too powerful, for he had seen in France and Normandy how the barons, being only a little less than the King, would combine and rebel against him; so he would not give adjacent manors to one lord, but spread them about in different parts of the country.

THE DOMESDAY BOOK.—Most of our information about the structure of the feudal system is derived from the Domesday Book. It received this name because it was drawn up with such careful accuracy, and based upon such minute investigation and sworn evidence that there could be no appeal from its findings—any more than a person could appeal from that Last Judgement of Domesday. Supposed to have been compiled in 1085-7, the Domesday Book gave William the information he required for the purposes of taxation and of military defence. It detailed the extent of the manors, the character of the land, how it was held (whether directly by the lord, or sub-let), the rateable value of the land, the number and status of its cultivators, and the number of cattle and ploughs it possessed. Gibbins' *Industrial History* furnishes examples of entries in the Domesday Book, and he also sums up its conclusions as to the number of manors, the proportions of waste, arable, and pasture land, and

gives many interesting figures which show that 75 per cent. of a population of 2,000,000 were engaged in agriculture. Leaving the student with this textbook to read up the further details for himself, we will pass on to the last heading of this Outline.

THE FEUDAL STRUCTURE.—One writer has described the Feudal System as “a vast hierarchy of rights and duties, an unbroken chain from the King down to the serf.” A cone with its base upon the land and at its point the Church represents its shape. In the Anglo-Saxon development we saw how the temporary war-chief became a permanent king, and how petty kings fought each other till one of them triumphed. But under Feudalism even the King did not possess absolute ownership of the land. Just as the serf was bound to obey the lord of the manor, and the lord of the manor his lord the King, so the King was held in theory to be responsible to God for the good government and defence of his subjects. This theory was taught by the Roman Church, which in that superstitious age had immense power and the fear of excommunication then made even kings tremble. The Church was the channel through which the will of God was made known to earthly rulers. Not that her power rested solely on her monopoly of Divine inspiration, for many of the ecclesiastical barons outshone the secular barons in the magnificence of their retinue, in their lavish hospitality, and in the number of retainers that they, as members of the Church truly militant, led into battle.

It does not come within our present scope to show how the above theory was departed from in practice; how Church and King quarrelled for supremacy; how the barons would league against the King or fight among themselves; how the rights of the serf to protection were neglected; or how combinations, born of adversity, were made when the barons would unite for a while with the towns against the King, or the King use the rising class in the towns to plunder the Church and weaken the barons. These developments

will receive treatment when we deal with the fall of Feudalism.

The Feudal System was based upon the land, which was then the chief means of production. Amid the many classes referred to by historians, two stand out most prominently—a class which could own and part with land, and a class which was bound to the land, being able neither to possess nor part with it. The tenants-in-chief—the lords—had to render to the King (1) Military services—*i.e.*, men for war; build roads and bridges, and make fortifications; (2) The Geld. This was a tax for emergencies. In addition, they had to pay the tithe to the Church. The villeins and the cottars were bound to the estate upon which they were born. They had to render to their lord a rent of services which was composed of (1) week work, and (2) boon work, the former being so many days per week, and the latter being certain days at fixed times in the year. Sometimes rent in kind had to be paid at certain seasons—*e.g.*, one quarter of seed wheat at Michaelmas.

BOOKS:

Gibbins, Period II., Chap. I., contains an excellent description of a manor village, its inhabitants, and their conditions, besides a diagram of a typical manor and all the other details of the Feudal System. We can best understand the position of the serf by comparing it with the position of other types of workers—*i.e.*, the chattel slave and the modern wage-worker—and this comparison will occupy the next Outline.

V.—THE SLAVE, THE SERF, AND THE MODERN WAGE-WORKER

OFTEN, when complaining of the amount of work which falls to the lot of the modern worker, one is met with the assurance that work has always been necessary to support life, and always will be; and with an air of "as it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be," and of the last possible word on the subject having been said, your monitor goes away and makes of his necessity to labour a virtue, and feels proud that he is doing his bit of this unavoidable toil. It is quite true that labour has always been necessary, and that, since civilisation began, there has always been a working-class. This fact, however, does not justify resignation to the present scheme of things. In the present Outline an attempt will be made at a very brief examination of the various classes of workers who have existed, and a comparison of them with the modern working-class.

THE SLAVE.—The probable origin of slavery was in war. There came a time in the economic development of man when he found that it was more profitable for him to retain the prisoners of war as slaves than to eat or destroy them. Then only did cannibalism become a sin. A slave would have been a useless burden before the domestication of animals and the development of agriculture began. The patriarchs in the early books of the Bible had their bondmen, and there are many other references which reveal the existence and growth of slavery in the Jewish nation. All the ancient Empires were built upon a slave economy. Greece and Rome are the best-known examples. In both it developed as the Empire decayed; the freemen, the founders of their greatness, were destroyed in wars, enslaved by their creditors, or became a landless mob, whose former holdings were owned by large proprietors and worked by slave labour. The Grecian phil-

osophers accepted slavery as a provision of Providence whereby they could be freed from the work of the world to spend their time in contemplation. Aristotle declared slavery to be necessary and a part of the law of Nature—just as the intellectual defenders of Capitalism to-day try to persuade the worker that the present system is natural and eternal. At one time in Greek history there were according to Wallon three slaves, and according to other estimates ten slaves, to every free man. Gibbins, in his *History of Commerce*, gives £4 as the price of a slave in Greece.

In Rome the same story was repeated; the Gentile bonds of kinship and the freeholders were destroyed. Some individuals possessed as many as 10,000 slaves. While Alexanders and Cæsars marched over the world with conquering armies, the work of the world was being performed by slaves. The wealth of money and slaves these conquerors obtained only hastened the breaking-up process. Lecky says that slavery in Europe was almost unknown by the 14th century; it was displaced by serfdom. By the 14th century serfdom itself was disappearing in the more advanced countries. But commenced by the Portuguese in 1442, we see one of the most horrible chapters in human history opened—colonial slavery revived and intensified all the terrors of Ancient Slavery. In America it disappeared after the American War of 1861-5. In England slaves were advertised and sold for the Colonies in 1770, but in 1807 the slave traffic was made illegal in British possessions. It was found that more severe penalties to prevent the traders violating this act were necessary in 1811. Abolition with compensation to the planters was carried in 1833.

There are several differences between the slave and the wage-worker:—(1) The slave, while he was useful, had a guarantee of existence in just the same way as a man must keep his horse alive. Therefore there was no competition for work or unemployment among slaves. (2) The slave had no legal rights; he could not appear in the law courts; his marriages were not recog-

nised, and he was not allowed to own property. His master could crucify him or cut him up to feed the goldfish, or elevate him into being a private secretary or confidential friend. Roman laws later interfered with this absolute power of the master. (3) The slave did not sell his labour power; he was himself sold, and, apparently, all his labour was unpaid, though, of course, his master had to provide his maintenance. (4) The slave could be made free by his individual master giving up his personal ownership. Many slaves were liberated by their masters as a reward of faithful service; some purchased their liberty when they were allowed to acquire property, and at times of national and personal thanksgiving, and on their death-beds, slave-owners, "for the good of their souls," gave liberty to their bondmen. This practice of "manumission" so increased that Cicero estimated that a well-behaved slave could obtain his freedom in six years. This state of affairs was not, however, universal, and when kidnapping and wars provided a plentiful supply of slaves, their lot was very wretched. Old and useless ones were left for the Tiber to wash away, while others were used as gladiators. There is nothing in slavery to warrant "hankerings after the past."

THE SERF.—The serf existed under the Feudal System, which in England, superseded the old commune or mark. In Rome the freed-slave and the beggared freeman became the feudal tenants of the barbarian invaders, who had no system of slavery. As in geology, where a certain stratum or layer of rock may be missing, yet never occurs out of its proper rotation, so in history. A nation may skip a stage of development through which other nations have passed, yet that stage never occurs out of its proper place. America will never have its feudal serfs. There is a controversy among historians as to whether or not the Feudal System was developed in England before the Norman Conquest in 1066; at any rate, the Norman Conquest made it general, and it lasted in its decay until the 17th century. However,

in the coal and salt mines of Scotland survivals persisted up to 1799. In Germany serfdom persisted till 1781; in Russia till 1861. In return for the protection of the feudal chief, the serf had to work a certain portion of his time upon his lord's estate. There are several points about his position that are worth notice.

(1) Unlike the slave he could not be sold. He was fixed, not to an individual, but to the soil, and he could not leave his birthplace, give his daughter in marriage, or apprentice his son, without his lord's consent. Like the slave, he had no fear of competition or unemployment, and his livelihood was secure. (2) His political status was low, like the slave, and his feudal lord's word was his law. (Only the wage-worker receives equality in the eyes of the law—a boasted equality which soon disappears in experience.) (3) The serf did not sell his labour-power or receive any wages. He owned, subject to certain restrictions, the means of production, which consisted at that time of the land; and the labour he had to put in upon his lord's estate stood out clearly and distinctly as unpaid labour. (4) Like the slave, the serf had a chance of obtaining individual freedom. For he could escape into the town and become a wage-worker in the guilds which were gradually growing, or he could get his services changed into payment in kind or in money, and become a tenant-farmer. Often he had behind him the old mark traditions and some vestiges of his former rights.

Elsewhere is an outline of the development of the various kinds of capital, usurers', merchant and industrial, and how their developments undermined Feudalism and made possible the modern wage-worker and the capitalist class. The guild handicraftsmen of the town, and the rural producer, who had his loom in his cottage, and who also cultivated a small farm, were types of workers who bridged the gap between the serf and the wage-worker.

THE WAGE-WORKER.—The chief points of interest about the modern wage-worker are as follows:—

(1) Unlike the slave and the serf, he is a “free” labourer and bound neither to an individual master nor to the soil. He is “free” to work or to be idle; “free” from the soil; “free” from the ownership of the means of production and from a secure livelihood; and often “free” from employment because of the competition for the job. At an hour, a day, or a week’s notice from either side, he and his employer can part.

(2) The modern wage-worker has a higher status in society than slave or serf. The same law applies to rich and poor—till the rich man charters a clever lawyer, and the judge, swayed by the unconscious bias of his class, gives his verdict. The slave and the serf were without the political privilege which the worker has, but political rights are only useful to him (the wage-worker) in so far as they are used to bring about economic rights and solve “bread-and-butter” problems.

(3) The wage-worker sells his power to labour at so much per hour, day, or week. [Piece-work rates are based upon the time taken by the average worker.] He owns neither the means of production nor the finished product. He receives the wages that were agreed upon, and while in the case of the slave all the labour seemed unpaid, in the case of the wage-worker he *appears* to be paid for all his labour. This is another illusion which needs explanation by the theory of “surplus-value.”

(4) While the worker as an individual appears to be free, he is bound—as a member of the working-class—to the capitalist class, through which he can alone find any employment, and to which alone he can sell his labour-power; therefore, his individual freedom resolves itself into freedom to starve if he cannot find an employer. The breaking of one relation emancipated the serf or the slave, but to emancipate the wage-working class it is necessary to change all property relations and substitute the common ownership of the means of production for private ownership. The guild handicraftsman stood a good chance of

becoming his own master; the individual slave might rise out from his fellows and escape from slavery; but the modern collier is in no danger of owning a modern colliery, and the wage-worker can only better his individual position by joining in the united effort of his class.

Great progress in the means of production has been made since the days of Greece and Rome. In America more wheat is now raised in 10 minutes than was raised in the time of Nero in four-and-a-half days. Leisure should no longer be the right of the cultured few, but be for the enjoyment of all. History tells of slave-revolts and serf-rebellions which were ruthlessly crushed by the ruling powers. The modern working-class—the wage-workers—are not destined to fail so hopelessly, for it is their mission to lift society up the next step in the stair of progress to where the necessary labour will be performed by all, and the fruits of all past development will be enjoyed by all. "So long as the industrial powers of Labour were undeveloped, work was inevitably a burden for the mass of mankind. The developments of those powers to their present prodigious dimensions involved the ruthless oppression of toiling millions. Chattel-slavery, serfdom, and wage-labour are the three leading acts of that sombre drama—the Tragedy of Labour."*

Capitalism has practically covered the world, and there is now no barbarian nation outside its influence who would be capable of invading the civilised nations and of sweeping them back, for a while, into a lower stage of development. The Yellow Peril yields its terrors when, after a lengthy period of stagnation, Japan and China are touched by the magic wand of Capitalism and are set developing at a rapid rate. Courageous and capable thinkers have applied to the situation in Russia the ideas and theories acquired by them from the more advanced industrial systems. The end of their attempt is not yet. Certain it is that the savage Tartar governed by a reactionary Tsar can

* W. W. Craik in *Railway Review*.

no longer be pictured as a potential destroyer of the advanced movements in other countries. The drama has become world-wide, and yet must still proceed. It is the modern wage-worker who must raise the curtain upon the next huge drama—a drama in which the sombre-hued Tragedy of Labour must disappear before its joyous triumph.

BOOKS:

Craik, Section I.

Paul's *The State*. Chaps. II. and III., for Greece and Roman slavery.

Sue's *The Iron Trevet* (S.L.P.). A novel giving a vivid portrayal of the unspeakable indignities suffered and the ruthless suppression of the revolts of the French serfs.

VI.—TOWNS AND TRADE IN THE MIDDLE AGES

AFTER the pause made for the purpose of comparison in our last Outline, we again take up the thread of development. The subject of this Outline has some difficulties in that, in dealing with it, we shall be forced to deal with other subjects which occur later in our Syllabus. For example, we cannot separate the Towns from the Guilds (allotted to Outline VII.); or dissociate Trade from The Rise of the Merchant Class (to be dealt with in No. IX.); and again we cannot show the rise of a new power without showing how it undermined the old—a process receiving attention in Outline VIII.—The Fall of Feudalism. However, these very difficulties show the utter impossibility of considering anything as “a thing in itself,” and reveal that vital interconnection, the basis of all things, which Dietzgen so repeatedly emphasised. They also point out that the evolution of the new must mean the devolution of the old. Perhaps, in dealing with the same period from particular phases, we shall get a truer, fuller picture of it.

The Middle Ages is a term elastic in its application. We shall try to follow Towns and Trade from their beginnings in England up to nearly the end of the 15th century, when the new manufacturing towns begin to arise in opposition to the older corporations. But before dealing with the particular progress of towns and trade in England, a few general conclusions, as to the stages and effects of their general progress, will be drawn. Human development in regard to trade and exchange (towns in their origin in England, as we shall show later, are inseparably connected with these) has passed through four general stages:—

THE FIRST STAGE.—It has been truly said that every-thing emerges from the imperceptible only to journey

back into it again; and in this first stage towns and trade were not. The family or tribe was then entirely self-sufficient. Perhaps its life was nomadic. Property, in our sense of the word, did not exist. The "cash nexus" was undreamt of; relations of blood and kinship were supreme. Production was solely for use—man made his garments, his tools, and procured his food only when he needed them. There being no commodity produced, no market was necessary. The prevalent ideas necessarily reflected the material conditions. Tribal deities and tribal morality existed in correspondence with tribal production; and while, as many travellers have testified, a high code of honour prevailed between tribal members, no such feelings actuated them in their dealings with any person who was not a member of their tribe. The very fact of being outside the tribe made him an enemy who might be rightly tricked, plundered, or destroyed.

THE SECOND STAGE.—In this stage of development, the family or tribal self-sufficiency has disappeared. (See Engels' *Origin of the Family* for information as to the forms of the family preceding the present monogamic form.) Property breaks down the bonds of kin. Each village is now self-sufficient—e.g., the Anglo-Saxon village and, in its early days, the Norman manor. Handicraft was slowly developing; each village had its semi-artisans, its swineherd, beeherd, and so on, who performed their particular work for their fellow-villagers and the lord of the manor, in addition to working on their own holding of land. The town developed from the large village—the difference between them, at first, being one of size rather than of character. But in the village and town trade soon begins. Markets and trade react upon the villages and turn them into towns; or the site of the market, originally on the neutral boundary, becomes a place of populous settlement. Hither the merchants would gather, and here later the semi-craftsmen would congregate endeavouring to escape the feudal bonds and earn their livelihood by the practice of their

craft alone. Other circumstances determining the site of towns will be detailed in dealing with towns in England. Though the self-sufficiency of the towns was a transitory stage, and though the merchants soon brought into touch with each other all the towns and villages, yet, for a while, at any rate, there existed a narrow mental outlook which, in the inhabitants of another town, saw an enemy; and long after towns strove with each other, at first for monopolies of certain kinds of trade, and later of production.

THE THIRD STAGE.—Here you get the nation a self-sufficient unit, with its fairs at first carried on by simple barter, which, soon becoming inconvenient to an increasing exchange, was displaced by metal coin. In the Anglo-Saxon development you will remember how the Danish invasion stimulated foreign trade. It also encouraged the use of money, because of the levying of the Dane-Geld, needed to buy off the marauders. The wide dominions of the Norman kings also encouraged trade with France. But, speaking generally, despite the existence of some international merchant leagues (e.g., The Hanseatic League), the merchants and early capitalists remained in national camps, under the protection of their own respective kings. As soon as the trade or production could be carried on without foreign help, jealousy demanded the restriction or exclusion of the foreign merchant. There was also an attempt to remove the barrier of town rivalries for the sake of the nation—a concept just coming into being. We hear of the conflict between differing national policies of “plenty” and of “power” enforced and tried in turn from the 13th to the 17th century to regulate trade and production for the national welfare. The foreigner was the enemy who had to be fought as a rival claimant when navigators discovered new lands of untapped wealth and potential markets; and with whom our colonies must not trade.

THE FOURTH STAGE.—In this stage even national barriers begin to disappear. The nations become dependent upon each other. John Locke gives way to

Adam Smith. Staple towns, Navigation Acts, taxes, bounties, and all other restrictions and monopolies, national or otherwise, are abominations preventing true progress. Colonies are now "white elephants." Trade does not "follow the flag" so much as before, if at all. The market has widened from the local and national to the world market. The use of the metals in exchange, once so great an advance upon barter, has become cumbrous, and a world-wide Capitalism develops its wondrous nervous system—*i.e.*, a credit-economy. The development of the means of communication and transport, the telegraph, the locomotive, the ocean cable, and the mammoth liner, knit the world together. Commodities from many climes stand upon our tables, and fill our shops. Ideas of internationalism should now be possible, and find expression in the breaking down of the barriers of nationality among citizens of the world.*

TOWNS AND TRADE IN ENGLAND.—The Roman towns were the first built in Britain, and some of them were re-occupied when trade began to develop among the Saxons. The earliest merchants were foreigners, and they brought articles of commerce from countries more advanced in their development than England. The existence of trade predicates the development of handicraft and a stage of development when agriculture does not demand the whole of the energies of a people. Early towns in England were trading centres. Trade preceded manufacture, and the Merchant Guild was here before the Craft Guild.

Town sites were determined by natural advantages; places easily defended by forts or surrounded by a

* If the reader desires to appreciate the true nature of the obstacles which block the way to this desirable state in modern times, and if he would understand the economic causes behind the revival of the nationalist-imperialist spirit and the second warlike period of Capitalism—which threaten, for a while at least, to rob us of the beneficial results of the ever-widening intercourse of trade—then he should direct his attention to the book and pamphlets mentioned at the end of Outline XIX.

moat; places of easy access, a river's mouth, or near a good harbour, or at the centre of the highways. In some countries they have grown up in the caravan routes, where the ships of the desert have their stopping places. Other towns would have their origin near the residence of a king or famous earl, or in the shadow of a monastery. Oxford is an example of the latter. London was rebuilt and famed as a port in A.D. 700. Bristol was another early seaport town. Markets as a cause of towns have already been referred to. The fairs, too, would also be the cause of towns, and both markets and fairs enjoying religious patronage would be held near the shrine of some saint, so that business and religion could be profitably combined. (For particulars of fairs and early towns, see chapters mentioned at end of Outline.)

As the town was only an enlarged village, it was subject, like the village, to the lord of the manor and also to the King. The lord of the manor exacted different kinds of payment from the traders in return for the right of holding markets and fairs. "The townsfolk lived to a large extent by sale of wares at the periodical fairs, but the wares had to be conveyed thither, and on their way were subject to taxes—'passage,' on passing through a manor; 'pontage,' for crossing a bridge; 'lastage,' a tax on goods by weight; and 'stallage,' for setting up a booth or stall in a fair or market." The rise to power of the towns was accomplished by buying out these taxes. "Their liberty was determined by the length of their purse." The towns, as we shall see more fully in our next Outline, were dominated at first by the Merchant Guilds, and they supplied needy nobles with foreign products and money to gratify their growing taste for luxury, or to enable them to go blood-letting in France and Palestine; and they (the merchants) would also help to ransom kings and supply money for war campaigns. In return for these payments they were granted privileges, and in many cases charters of freedom, which gave them the right of self-government and

freedom from all feudal dues. In the 1215 Charter there are trading clauses safeguarding their interests, and soon the boroughs were given representation in Parliament. Certain merchants in certain towns would also buy from the King "staples," *i.e.*, the monopoly of trading in certain products in certain places.

EARLY ARTICLES OF COMMERCE.—These were at first chiefly luxuries, though salt, a vital necessity for the winter supply of meat, was early imported from France when the sun in England did not shine enough to evaporate the water from the salt pans. Tar was also imported for use of the sheep-farmers. Millstones from near Paris and iron from Spain were other early foreign imports. Wool was the chief English export for many years. The foreign wars encouraged a display of luxury. Embroidery and weaving began to develop.

MONEY.—It is an interesting subject to follow how the medium of exchange, as we know it now, developed; and to follow the beginnings of usurers' capital. Barter soon was found to be cumbrous and inefficient. Coin came with settled government, and later banking and finally the credit system, economising the use of hard cash. The Jews were the first moneylenders, and the King protected them that he might plunder them himself. The philosophers condemned interest because money was naturally barren. The Church, too, at first, forbade the paying of interest, basing her objection upon the text: "Lend hoping to receive nothing again"; soon, however, she reconciled herself to accepting interest on the excuse of the time and trouble occasioned by the summoning in of loans. And later, in a trading age, she waxed fat by doing a roaring trade in relics and in pardons which forgave folk's sins and ensured their passage to endless bliss.

In conclusion, it might be remarked that the towns of the Middle Ages were very small in size, especially when compared with the modern town. The Domesday Book mentions 80 towns, and the whole country's population was only about two millions, while

London's population alone now numbers more than four and a-half millions (1911 census).

We shall endeavour to give details of the traders and producers, of their forms of organisation, and their strict regulation of trade and production in the next Outline. Beneath the flaunting of knight errantry, the loud sounding of trumpets and the costly foreign wars (the lengthy details of which so often have passed for history) there was proceeding in the towns of the Middle Ages the coming of a new power which was destined to destroy the system of Feudalism and all its relations.

BOOKS:

Gibbins, Period II., Chap. II. and Period III., Chap. III.

Warner, Chap. III.

Gibbins' *Commerce in Europe*. Book I. and II. (Macmillan, 4s.).

VII.—THE GUILDS

WE traced in our last Outline how man's intercourse with man, through the development of trade, moved in an ever-widening circle; and how every part of the world has now come to be interdependent, thus providing the material conditions to which correspond ideas of internationalism. The prices and movements of foreign stocks and shares now occupy the financial columns of our newspapers, and the world is woven together with stronger ties than those of sentiment. There was not even a village shop in the feudal manor; now we can "shop by post" at international emporiums. The poorest paid worker may now fill his pipe with tobacco perhaps grown in other continents; and the 300 millions of pounds of tea consumed in Britain annually are brought to us chiefly from India and China, thousands of miles away. Distance is nearly annihilated. A self-sufficient world has its particular districts for wheat and wool growing, cattle-raising, mining, and industrial production.

Man, from being "a jack of all trades," has become a specialist. His clothes are made and washed by specialists; his tools are made; his house is built; his food is cooked; his hair cut; and, in some cases, the very windows of his house cleaned, by specialists. The details of all these ramifications in the work of modern society would be nearly endless, but this division of labour outside the workshop—not to be confused with the division inside—is all the direct result of the development of trade, the beginnings of which formed our last lesson.

The Feudal System, once a useful and necessary system of landholding in turbulent times, was gradually undermined and superseded by the rise of this new force which had its centres in the towns. To paraphrase the words of Job: "Evolution giveth and evolution

take away; blessed be the name of evolution." Industrial History testifies that "Economic development putteth the mighty—in this case the feudal barons—from their seat and exalteth them of low degree"—who in this case were the early trading, servile serfs, subject at first to the exactions and control of the lord of the manor. The associations based upon the land gave way to associations based upon trading interests and craft, thus preparing the way for the "cash nexus" of our own day. The organisations representative of trade and production are our present subject.

KINDS OF GUILDS.—The word "guild" originally meant a sacrificial feast or festival, but in time it denoted the company of people who met at such a feast. The spirit of the mark was carried on into these associations. There were four kinds of Guilds:—

(1) *The Frith Guild.*—Probably the oldest, and, at first, a body of kinsfolk who bound themselves together for protection against dangers of any sort which might arise in warfare, legal matters, or sickness.

(2) *The Religious Guild.*—A company of fellow-believers who celebrated religious feasts together, dispensed charity, paid the Church burial fees, and had masses recited for the dead.

(3) *The Merchant Guild.*—An association of traders. These Guilds existed in England prior to the Conquest, as there is a reference in the Domesday Book to land being held by one of them. They were displaced in England in the 14th century.

(4) *The Craft Guild.*—A company of artisans all occupied in the same craft. So necessary and widespread was the idea of association and mutual help that there are even records of a Guild of prostitutes in Nuremburg.

As the two last-mentioned forms of Guilds are the most important, they alone deserve our further attention.

THE MERCHANT GUILDS.—In the latter half of the 11th century these Guilds flourished, and there are records of the existence of 102 in England, 30 in Wales, and 38 in Ireland. No town of any size could have been without one.

It is only natural that the whole-time merchant, trading in several commodities, should evolve before the artisan, making, and dependent upon, one commodity only. Then again it is easy to see why woollen cloth and gold were early commodities, for—unlike agricultural produce, produced for a local market and direct consumption—they possessed the necessary qualities of portability and comparative imperishability, and they were sure of a wide market, because they were in universal demand.

As pointed out previously, the merchants arose in spite of the exactions of the feudal lords. Other struggles took place between the home and "foreign" merchants for the right of trading in certain goods (the inhabitants of the different towns looked upon each other as foreigners). Then later in the 12th century, the Craft Guild fought, and finally beat, the Merchant Guild; and then, later still, the home craftsmen waxed indignant against the craftsmen introduced under royal patronage from abroad.

These struggles could not, of course, be carried on by individuals. Certain towns would become the centres of certain trades, and in many cases the town was dominated by the Merchant Guild of that trade. The Guild purchased the collective liberty, and when they (the townsmen) had won, or purchased, their collective liberty the Guild made itself responsible for the taxes and good government of the town. The merchant backed by his Guild gained strength; we have records of Merchant Guilds suing each other in their corporate capacity for debts contracted by their members.

The Guildsmen elected their own Mayor and officials and fixed and regulated their own markets. In the strict trade regulations which they made, their policy

was very exclusive and narrow, aiming to keep the trade in the hands of the burgesses of the town and keeping a very strict, jealous watch upon, and placing at serious disadvantage, the stranger who was not a Guild member, and who did not pay his share toward the freedom of the town. Each town had its protective system against the others. The following quotation from Warner's *Landmarks in English Industrial History* will give the reader some idea of the regulations enforced to control trade and to keep the Guild exclusive:—

No one but a Guild member was to buy in order to sell again in the town; nor could he buy honey, salt herring, oil, millstones, leather or hides, nor sell wine, save on days of fair or market, or hold more than five quarters of corn to sell by retail. . . . The fish and meat markets were to be supervised by officials; butchers were not to sell bad meat, nor to cast offal in the streets, nor to smoke pork before their houses or in the street; fish brought in a ship was not to be unloaded or sold without leave of bailiff; only he who had caught the fish could offer fresh fish for sale in the street, nor was fish to be bought save between sunrise and sunset. Repeating (buying in order to sell again in the same market) of kids, lambs, birds, ewes, capons, fowls, fresh cheese, butter and eggs, was forbidden until a certain hour, and until the townsmen had had time to buy their food. All these rules, and many others, were enforced by fines or, in some cases, imprisonment, and the "loss of the Guild" when it was a Guildsman who was at fault—a heavy penalty, for it reduced the offender to the rank of a stranger.

Leaving the student to read up further details for himself, we notice that in time crafts became possible; the craftsmen separated themselves from the merchants and tried to destroy these "middlemen."

THE CRAFT GUILD.—The Craft Guild arose a hundred years later than the Merchant Guild, and is first heard of in 1130. Early examples of the Craft Guild in England were the Weaver's Guild and the Goldsmith's Guild; these crafts, as pointed out previously, dealing in commodities which were among the earliest produced.

The rise to power of the Craft Guild displaced the Merchant Guild. On the Continent the struggle was fierce, but in England the Craft Guild soon overcame its rival. Originally the craftsman may have held land or been also a member of the Merchant Guild; but now the workers in each craft drew together in powerful Guilds for the management of their craft.

Both the Merchant and Craft Guild enjoyed religious patronage, trying to maintain a shrewd eye to their own advantage in both worlds. The Craft Guilds successfully controlled production until the 16th century, when we see the rise of new towns built away from the old in order to escape the regulations and restrictions of the Craft Guilds. In these new towns the workers were assembled in manufactories; a division of labour inside the workshop was made; a merchant class, with very different ideas from the Merchant Guild, intervened and helped to circulate factory products, and, encouraged and aided by the throne, they helped to develop national markets. The Crafts in the old towns soon became picturesque relics of a superseded method of production. In future Outlines this decay will be more fully dealt with; let us examine the Craft Guilds in their prime.

Just as the Merchant Guild tried hard to preserve trade monopolies, so the Craft Guild tried hard to keep a monopolistic hold upon production. They closely preserved "the mysteries" of their craft. Long apprenticeship and the production of a certain standard of work preceded admittance. Gibbins, p. 29, writes:—

The Guild tried to secure good work on the part of its members, and attempted to suppress the production of wares by irresponsible persons who were not members of the craft. Their fundamental principle was that a member should work not only for his own private advantage, but for the reputation and good of his trade; hence bad work was punished and it is curious to note that nightwork was prohibited as leading to poor work.

The Guild also supported its members in case of

sickness and death, and every craftsman behaved himself in order to keep unstained the name and reputation of his Guild. This moral control still lingers in the indentures of the compositor, who is forbidden to frequent overmuch ale-houses, dicing, gambling, and the company of immoral women. Competition was entirely eliminated. Prices were determined, not by "supply and demand," but by usage and regulation. The maxims: "A fair day's wage for a fair day's work" and "A fair price for a good article" were then practical, and adhered to. Production was not "anticipatory" as to-day; the person needing a suit of clothes would order the cloth from the Weaver's Guild, and then take it to the Tailor's Guild and get it made up. There were thus no fluctuations of overwork and unemployment. The number of journeymen to be employed was fixed, and thus no Guildsman could increase his business at will. But in time this rigid exclusiveness, which had once been beneficial in standardising and guaranteeing the quality of the products, became a fetter upon production. The textile industry was again a pioneer in developing new methods; and foreign craftsmen—*e.g.*, the Flemings—brought new ideas and methods and simple machines which the old Craft Guilds would not adopt. Again, by high entrance fees and the creation of hereditary privileges, the Guilds became more exclusive and narrow. Tracing out other internal divisions leads us on to our next heading.

THE GUILD WORKER.—In the early days of the Craft Guild the apprentice could look forward with reasonable certainty to becoming a master himself. The tools used were small and inexpensive. As one writer has remarked: "It is easier to own a hand than a steam hammer." And we might add that it is easier to own a bucket and windlass than the shaft haulage equipment of a modern colliery; or to own a man-drill than an electric coal-cutter. Then, too, the personal relation between master and man had not been broken by the present unbridgable chasm. The possibility of the

journeyman becoming master grew less as the master craftsmen developed into a plutocratic oligarchy, carrying on the Guild not for the good of the craft, but of themselves. They restricted apprentices, and endeavoured to prevent journeymen becoming masters and to make them wear a special livery. Thereupon journeymen's associations sprang up, despite the bitter complainings of the master craftsmen, who accused them of meeting professedly for social and friendly benefits, but under this disguise conspiring to secure higher wages. These associations contain the germ of the modern Trade Unions.

There are some differences, however, between Guilds and Trade Unions, which completely spoil the parallels made by some writers between them. The Guild regulated production; and protected and sold the products of labour. It centred round the commodity market. The Trade Union protects and advances the interest of those who have at present no regulation or control over production, and who have but one commodity in their possession—*i.e.*, their labour power. It centres round the labour market. One owned the means of production; the other is completely divorced from them. Subsequent lessons will help us to understand how this divorce occurred and all its resulting effects.

BOOKS:

Gibbins, Period III.

Warner, Chaps. III. and VII.

Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations*. (Dent, 4s.). Book I., Chap. I., would help the student to appreciate the advantages of a division of labour inside the workshop, and prepare him for future lessons. Marx's *Capital*, Vol. I., Chap. XIV., contains an even more able exposition of the same subject.

Renard's *Guilds in the Middle Ages* (Bell and Sons, 2s.) is worthy of attention.

VIII.—THE FALL OF FEUDALISM

IN the Fourth Outline details of the Feudal System were given. Two of the intervening Outlines have been occupied with the development of trade and towns, and with information about the early traders and producers living in those towns. We have now to turn to Feudalism—which was essentially rural in its character—and endeavour to see how it was affected, and how its decay was caused by the progress of new forces having their chief centres in the towns.

In feudal times, the vast hierarchies of Church and State were based upon the land. Agriculture was the sole industry and production was carried on for direct consumption. The exploitation of the serf was undisguised, taking the form of services in rent and kind. Feudalism, having its origin in the domination of the fighter over the farmer, necessarily preserved, as its source of power over the agriculturist and as the only method by which it could “carry on,” its military organisation. Our present task is to outline the chief factors which hastened its passing. The rise of commerce, the development of handicraft and the division of labour, the evolution of the commodity (*i.e.*, a product produced primarily for exchange) from the product produced for direct consumption—these are some of the things to which we shall briefly refer.

COMMUTATION OF SERVICES.—The substitution of money payments or rents for the previous services and payments in kind rendered by the villeins and cottars to their feudal lord, plays an important part in the fall of Feudalism. We have, in previous Outlines, shown how the towns purchased their liberty from feudal dues; they arrived at independence earlier than the country; and by the aid of the kings, who needed their help against powerful barons, they procured charters of self-government. The need of kings and nobles for money was the opportunity for the towns to win their freedom, and soon, by the growth of commerce, luxury

increased. The feudal lords became willing to accept money instead of services from the country-dwellers also. Adam Smith describes the process thus:—"The inhabitants of trading cities, by importing the improved manufactures and expensive luxuries of richer countries, afforded some food to the vanity of the great proprietors, who eagerly purchased them with great quantities of the rude produce of their own lands." It is easy to see how this would pave the way for the commutation of services; for the feudal lord would think to secure more luxuries by receiving definite sums of money from his feudal dependants than he would secure by the exchange of the products produced by their enforced labour upon his own demesne.*

The villeins and the cottars, too, would not be opposed to this commutation of their services; for they naturally connected the liberty of the townspeople with their possession of, and payments in, money, and the serfs thought to secure the same liberty for themselves. Again "the week-work" and the "boon-work" were elastic, and apt to be increased as the lord's appetite for luxuries grew. The cottar, with his small landholding and with more free time at his disposal, gradually developed into the wage-labourer, and the villein became a farmer, paying a money rent, often for stock as well as land.

§ THE EXPORT OF ENGLISH WOOL.—In dealing with the Rise of the Merchant Class and the Creation of the Proletariat in future Outlines, we shall have occasion to deal with the development of wool-growing more fully. But as early as A.D. 1236, we get examples of enclosures made for this purpose, and very soon all the waste land of the manor was claimed by the lord. Large quantities of English wool were exported in

* In Germany, according to Engels, this vanity of the hitherto coarsely-fed and clothed and roughly-furnished lord caused him to turn the free members of the mark into serfs, which resulted in the Peasants War of 1525.

return for foreign manufactures. Later happenings, with which we shall deal, hastened this tendency to displace men by sheep and to break up the feudal relations.

EFFECTS OF WAR.—The strong hand of the Norman kings kept the barons in check for a while in England. In the Civil War of Stephen and Matilda, however, they became again lawless and powerful, and they exercised their feudal profession of fighting in suicidal conflicts. In the latter half of the 15th century (1455–1480) in the Wars of the Roses, the barons again obligingly hastened their own extermination. The power of the towns and the king grew greater. The first Tudor monarch, Henry VII., seeking to establish himself firmly, was able to make the remaining barons disband their little armies of retainers. This created many wandering vagrants and robbers, and also increased the number of the town-dwellers.

Not only internal wars helped on the decay of Feudalism; external wars and foreign expeditions had the same effect. The Crusades, or Wars of the Cross, which lasted for more than two centuries, beginning in A.D. 1095, are a notable example of the latter.*

* Prior to the Crusaders, the mild rule of the Saracens had allowed Christian pilgrims to visit Jerusalem and had allowed European merchants free access to the Eastern trade routes. The sea route to the East had not then been discovered. The coming of fanatical caliphs and the invasion of Palestine by the Turks blocked up these vital trade routes and made pilgrimage difficult and unsafe. Ordinarily, the Church tried to restrain the warlike ardour of the feudal barons. On this occasion, however, they found a common cause. The feudal fighting fire, languishing for an outlet in Europe, was now encouraged, organised and dedicated by the Church to the high and noble aim of restoring to the Church, from the blasphemous infidels, her sacred places. The traders, especially of the Italian cities, having their sources of wealth destroyed; the feudal fighters needing more lands to conquer, and being eager to plunder the fabled wealth of the East; and the all-powerful Church, feeling that her prestige would be destroyed if the infidels' success was permanent, united and formed a strong combination. This was the foundation upon which rested the success of Peter the Hermit's

EFFECTS OF NEW METHODS OF WAR.—New methods of war, too, played a part in the decline of Feudalism. The splendid feudal finery—the splendid coats of mail and accoutrements and the richly caparisoned chargers—became effete in competition with trained bands of mercenaries who used, at first, the long-bow, and, later, firearms. The romance of robbery disappeared when the merchants were able to secure efficient protection by engaging base-born churls. With the invention of gunpowder and its use in the 14th and 15th centuries, armour and castle strongholds were of little avail. Brain began its triumph over brawn, and proceeded, until to-day warfare is practically carried on by spectacled chemists. Engels, on p. 195 of his *Landmarks in Scientific Socialism*, when endeavouring to prove the economic nature of force, writes thus:—

The introduction of firearms not only produced a revolution in the methods of warfare, but also in the relations of master and subject. Trade and money are concomitants of gunpowder and firearms, and these former imply the bourgeoisie. Firearms from the very first were the bourgeois instruments of warfare employed on behalf of the rising monarchy against the feudal nobility. The hitherto unassailable stone castles of the nobles submitted to the cannon of the burghers, the fire of their guns pierced the mail armour of the knights. The supremacy of the nobility fell with the heavily armed cavalry of the nobility.

eloquence, which caused peasant and prince, young and old, to rush forth to defend the Faith. As the Crusades proceeded, their economic causes became more manifest. No lasting settlements were ever made in Palestine because of the internal rivalry and jealousy of the feudal crusaders, each wishing to secure land and booty.

It is not, however, our purpose to follow the various phases of the Crusades until they finally petered out in the 14th century, but to notice that the Crusades and other foreign wars had the effect of weakening Feudalism; for “while princely adventurers and their turbulent followers left Europe to seek for fame and conquest in the East, astute monarchs (and the towns) were establishing the reign of law in the West.”

THE BLACK DEATH.—This is one of the most important and terrible landmarks in English history. It was a calamity widespread in its devastation and fatal in its effects, for it is reckoned to have caused the death of nearly half England's population. In dealing with other factors we have tried to show that the tendencies of the age were gradually breaking up the Feudal System. The Black Death rapidly hastened the development of these tendencies. It might well be compared in its hastening of development to the present war, which is stimulating, not introducing, the application of science and machinery and the dilution of labour, to production.

In 1316 a bad harvest caused a famine of wheat, resulting in some loss of life from starvation. After the country had recovered from this, a fairly prosperous time ensued till the coming of the pestilence in 1348. It swept through the land with such terrible effects that it threatened to wipe out all the inhabitants. "About half the entire population was swept away. No age was safe, no rank was immune, for the habits and homes of the people of all classes were then indescribably filthy; but the common folk suffered most."

The economic effects of the Black Death as they helped on the decay of Feudalism concern us most. They were:—(1) A dearth of labour. The workers, suffering most from the ravages of the pestilence, were small in number. (2) A consequent rise in wages. These were double what they had been in 1347. The law of "supply and demand" operated in the labourer's favour. The landowners had either to pay the wages demanded or lose their labourers, and allow their land to go to rack and ruin. The landlords were loud in their complaints. Before Parliament met, the King issued Proclamations ordering no person, under severe penalties, to give or take higher wages than had obtained before the pestilence; and when Parliament met in 1350 it passed the First Statute of Labourers confirming the King's proclamations with all its penalties.

In vain, however, did the legislative Canutes attempt to keep back the tide of economic development. The farmers had either to lose their crops or pay the high wages demanded for their gathering; and despite Acts of Parliament high wages were paid. The Black Death hit the large landowner the hardest, because, the increased cost of labour having to be paid by his tenants as well as by himself, he dared not raise his tenants' rent. Thus he would let out more of his land and stock to peasant farmers, who, by using the labour of their families, escaped paying the increased wages. The Black Death, in making the wage-labourer's position better and in hastening the development of the tenant-farmer, was a big nail in Feudalism's coffin.

But the big landlords did not accept the new situation without a struggle. They remembered how in the old days they had been able to command the labour of the serf as a right; and they regretted that they, by commutation, had allowed this right to be destroyed. Aided by the lawyers—their friends then as now—they attempted to re-enforce the old "week-work" and "boon-work" and to place the labourer back again in the serf status. The friction and indignation which resulted from this attempt gave birth to an uprising which we must briefly describe.

THE PEASANT'S REVOLT OF 1381.—Many superficial reasons have been put forward to explain this outbreak, which was full of significance in showing how high wages and independence had engendered, in the once servile serfs, a spirit which would not brook the revival of the old exactions. As, later, the Indian Mutiny was falsely said to have been caused by the greasing of cartridges with a certain fat, so the Peasants' Revolt was falsely said to have been caused by the insulting behaviour of the Poll-Tax gatherer to Wat Tyler's daughter. Even the friction caused by the Poll-Tax itself hardly provides a sufficient cause, as it had been gathered before without any disturbance. These things may have precipitated the Revolt; they

may have been the match to the train of powder already laid; but the true cause is the one assigned above.

The comparative economic independence of the workers voiced itself in the revolutionary ideas and expressions of the times. The peasants received much help and encouragement from Wyclif's "poor priests." "When Adam delved and Eve span, who was then the gentleman?" So ran the rhyme, recalling primitive equality. These priests did not shrink from denouncing the upper classes and comparing their lot with the lot of those who laboured. Readers are referred to the chapters listed and to such fiction as William Morris' *The Dream of John Ball*, and Florence Converse's *Long Will* for further information.

They, too, will tell the story of how the whole country blazed, with Kent, where men had been longest quit of feudal tenure, as the centre of the revolt: of how the insurgents possessed themselves of London; of how they petitioned the King that "we be forever never named as villeins"; and of how they were soothed by false promises—the pledges of princes as of politicians being, even in those days, like the proverbial piecrust—and persuaded to return home, after which the Revolt was crushed.

But in spite of this apparent failure, the peasants were never reduced to the old feudal bondage again, and a time of prosperity for them, known as the Golden Age, followed. (See Gibbins, pp. 79 and 80, for details as to wages and cost of living.) We shall follow in succeeding *Outlines* the disappearance of this Golden Age. Only about 100 years elapsed, and in 1593 "the work of a whole year would not supply the labourer with the quantity [of foodstuffs] which in 1495 the labourer earned with 15 weeks' labour" (Thorold Rogers).

We have noticed some of the factors which played a part in the passing of Feudalism—the growth of its own inherent germs of decay. We have seen legislation and coercion powerless in the face of economic development, and those who attempted to stand still

or move backward, when economic development cried "Forward," condemned to a futile, hopeless endeavour.

BOOKS:

Gibbins, Period III., especially Chaps. IV. and V.

Warner, Chap. VI.

Marx's *Capital*, Vol. I., Chaps. XXVII. and XXVIII.

Paul's *The State*, Chap. VII.

IX.—THE RISE OF THE MERCHANT CLASS

This Outline should be read in conjunction with No. VI., because "Towns and Trade" and "The Rise of the Merchant Class" are inseparable.

IN dealing with our present topic, the impossibility of properly understanding history or explaining it without a thorough knowledge of economics is again demonstrated. One cannot explain the rise of the merchant class without having a clear understanding of the nature of merchant's capital. Thoroughly to grasp how, from the early forms of capital—merchant's and usurer's—the modern form, industrial capital, developed, is to receive an invaluable key to historical progress. It is to witness a quantitative change, or accumulation, produce in time a qualitative difference.

EARLY MERCHANTS.—As we have pointed out previously that England was introduced to trade by foreign merchants, a brief glance at some prominent examples of these foreigners will form a fitting introduction to our study of the rise of the English merchants. Under communal production, when use-values were exchanged for direct consumption, the merchant was unnecessary. In two societies there must be a difference in the manner of livelihood and in the products of labour before trade is necessary. Hence trade was encouraged when cattle-raising and agriculture were adopted by certain peoples before the others; and it also grew as the difference between town and country increased in later times. Again, a nomadic people, coming in contact with other peoples in different stages of development, would be most likely early to acquire trading habits. Thus we find that the earliest merchants prominent in history were the descendants of nomadic tribes, wandering herdsmen, who journeyed to and fro between the Euphrates and the Nile, then the centres of civilisation. The Phœnicians, the Arabs and the Jews were these early trading peoples. The Chinese were also early in the

field, although their doings are not so well known to us.

The development of the Phœnician nation, those "colossal pedlars," was very rapid. "Already in the year 1000 B.C.," writes Untermann, "the Phœnicians had great and flourishing seaports in the cities of Sidon, Tyre, and lesser towns along the coast, and not only dominated the sea trade, but also drew a large portion of the overland eastern and southern trade into their control." Space forbids any detailed account of the quantity and variety of the wealth which passed through their hands, and of the many trading ports they established in the Mediterranean. Internal dissensions and the onslaughts of Assyrian and Babylonian kings, greedy for the amassed Phœnician wealth, caused Phœnicia to disappear, and her place in Mediterranean commerce was taken by her daughter-city, Carthage.

The Arabs have retained their nomadic habits until recent years, being engaged perforce in overland, and not sea, trade, alternately plundering and protecting the caravans, and often indulging in internecine tribal conflict. The desire of Empires for raw material, fields for investment, and markets for iron and steel will soon, however, "railroad" them into civilisation and set them evolving in line with the other peoples of the world. Projects like the Cape to Cairo and the Bagdad railways invade and forever destroy their desert solitudes.

The Jews were later in their development than the Phœnicians. They were hardly given a chance to settle down by their turbulent neighbours. But even in these brief periods, the dissolving effects of wealth on the national unity by the creation of class divisions are apparent in the Biblical denunciations of those who "add house to house and field to field."* The environment of the Jews was such that "only the crafty merchant could survive." The Jews became "a tramping race of pedlars and moneylenders, spreading by

* See Isaiah v., 8

stealth over the entire face of the ancient and mediæval world, and existing only on suffrance, but developing from this very reason a craftiness and resourcefulness, which made some of them the secret rulers of the fate of nations by means of their underground accumulations of gold and silver."

MERCHANTS IN FEUDAL TIMES.—The development of those twin-brothers, merchants' and usurers' capital, destroys the very conditions necessary to their existence. The merchant thrives when there are many independent bidders for his wares. The usurer prospers when there are many little proprietors who may be driven by sudden accident, war, or sickness into his clutches. But in the accumulation of wealth by the merchants, not only did they excite the envy of foreign powers, who often seized their treasuries, but they created in society an internal division between rich and poor. Ties of wealth broke down all former bonds. In the divorce of the freemen from their holdings, and the resulting creation of large proprietors and slaves, merchants' and usurers' capital destroyed their own customers. Being thus weakened by internal dissensions, the ancient empires were an easy prey to the barbarians, who, as we have before explained, instituted, in the turbulent times which followed, the Feudal System. Thus an important step forward into another system of society was taken.

The Church—then the only international organisation—helped to revive trade after the feudal "slump." The missionary and the trader made their outposts together. The merchants of the Italian towns, trading in Eastern luxuries, soon achieved prominence. Across the Alps, German trading towns in touch with the Italian towns sprang up. They leagued themselves together for strength. We read of these merchant leagues forming credit banks, and by boycotting the thieving nobles teaching them their power. Mention is made in English history of the one-time yearly visits to England of the Venetian Fleet, and the Hanseatic

League had a flourishing colony of merchants in London down to Edward IV.'s time.

Trade was stimulated by the Crusades (11th, 12th and 13th centuries), which introduced into Europe sugar, cotton, and many other things now of everyday use. The effects on Feudalism of these undermining influences have already been dealt with.

THE WOOL TRADE.—Wool was England's chief early export. The foreign merchants appreciated the quality of the English wool, and shipped it in huge quantities to Flanders for manufacture into those finer cloths which were at that time beyond the skill of the English weavers. Two-thirds of our total exports were wool. Taxes and tithes were raised on the wool trade, and often paid in wool. Gibbins' paragraph—Wool and Politics (pp. 48–50)—should be carefully read to gain some idea of the economic interests which formed the basis of the Flemish alliance, and to understand how kingly and papal revenues were furnished by the wool trade. "Both Church and King sat comfortably on the wool sack."

Later the woollen cloth was manufactured in England. Kings and Parliaments tried to encourage this by the importation of foreign weavers, and by various legal enactments; the export of wool and the import of woollen cloth were forbidden in 1258 and 1271 respectively. The persecution of the Huguenots in France and Alva's attempt to convert Holland to the Roman Catholic faith (see Motley's *Rise of the Dutch Republic*) drove many industrious non-conformist workers to our shores, who brought with them new methods and new crafts.

16TH CENTURY DEVELOPMENTS.—Trade and manufacture thus gradually expanded, but it should be noted that, unlike the merchant of the Guild, the modern merchant is the servant and not the master of production. The Tudor monarchs shrewdly encouraged the merchants and the small manufacturers against the barons and the Church. The end of the 15th century saw the opening up of new worlds. The Mediterranean

towns lost their commercial supremacy to the towns which faced the Atlantic. The hitherto trackless ocean was spanned, and trails were blazed in new worlds. The voyage of Columbus in 1492, the discovery of a sea route to India round the Cape by Vasco Da Gama in 1498, Cabot's voyage to Labrador in 1497—these are some of the chief examples of the discoveries which revolutionised the trade of the Old World.*

The cessation of the Venetian Fleet's visit in 1532 and the withdrawal of the Hanseatic merchants' charter in 1597 mark a time when the English merchants triumphed over the foreign merchants, and were able to stand alone. Many merchant companies were formed to trade with particular districts, the most famous of which was the East India Company formed in 1600. Space forbids more than a brief reference to the wars for trade monopolies with Spain, Portugal and Holland, and later, for occupation of colonies as well as trade monopolies, which began in this period.

MERCANTILE ECONOMY.—The doings of the merchants cannot be considered apart from their ideas concerning commerce and the creation of value. Under communal or natural production, labour, as the cause of value, would be easily recognised. But this would be hid from the merchant who took no part in production. Taking advantage of the different products produced by different societies, often in differing stages of development, to profitably practise his motto "Buy cheap and sell dear," the merchant thought that value was created in circulation. And when money became the universal commodity the merchant was able to hoard this form of wealth in a manner which had been impossible while payment in kind prevailed. Thus the Mercantile School of Economics, whose chief thinker was John Locke, laid it down that profit was made by exchange, and that nations and individuals prosper

* In Outline XI. the effects of the round-the-world voyages of Magellan and Drake, in 1520 and 1557—1581 respectively, upon current conceptions of the world's shape, will receive attention.

according to the proportion of their hoards of the precious metals. They (the Mercantilists) believed that all exports were paid for by coin or bullion; therefore, by corn bounties, by prohibition of the import of certain articles which could be made in England, and by Navigation Acts designed to secure monopolies and rights for English shipping, they endeavoured to keep the balance of trade (*i.e.*, an excess of exports over imports) in their favour, so that the nation with whom they traded would have to make good the difference by shipping across some of its store of the precious metals. The patriot was the exporter; the enemy, the importer.

The ruin of Spain, by the continued shipping into it of the precious metals, is an example of the disastrous results of this policy. The English American colonies too, broke away from the restrictions placed upon their activities by regulations seeking to secure exclusively to the Mother-Country the benefits of their trade. Adam Smith, in 1776, attacked and helped to bury the Mercantile fallacies; the repeal of the Corn Laws in the first half of the 19th century was the final triumph of Free Trade which he advocated as spokesman of the Capitalist Class, then in its Manchester period.*

* A short digression may be made here to state that profits are made in production, and not in circulation. The capitalists do not get rich by buying cheap and selling dear. Two persons cannot live by taking in one another's washing or by cheating each other. If a person buys cheaply, then someone must have sold cheaply; or if he has sold dearly then someone must have bought dearly. A bicycle worth £10, perhaps through ignorance or particular needs of its owner, is exchanged for a table worth only £5; but, though the values have changed hands, the total of £15 (10 plus 5) is still unaltered. In modern production the capitalist, needing a quick turnover, instead of selling his goods himself, sells them to the merchant at sometimes a little less than their price of production (*i.e.*, wear and tear of machinery, raw materials, wages, etc., plus the average rate of profit determined by the competition of capitals of differing composition in industry). In this way, on such occasions, he is forced to yield up a part of his share of the surplus value contained in the goods to the merchant, who may, or may not,

METHODS OF ACCUMULATION.—In conclusion, we will notice the methods adopted by the merchants to secure that accumulation which formed the starting point for the industrial capitalist. We are often told about, and asked to admire, the careful capitalist who by the exercise of "abstinence" collected his original capital. But in following the merchants of Spain, Holland and England in their relations with the backward inhabitants of the new continents which they discovered, we find a terrible tale which gives quite another explanation of how the necessary accumulation which forms the starting point of industrial capital was formed. An hour or two spent with some of the later chapters in *Capital*, Vol. I., will convince the reader that it was not a case of "roses, roses all the way" in this development. The robbery of the Spanish galleons and mule trains and the capture and sale of slaves by the gallant pirates of good Queen Bess; the merciless exploitation of the Dutch colonies; and the tale of corruption and greed told in connection with the doings of the East India Company in India—these are only examples of "that conquest, plunder, and enslavement of foreign lands and peoples" which played so large a part in these "idyllic" proceedings of primitive accumulation. As Anatole France has said—"The coloured races know us only by our crimes."

Yet accumulation is not capital until something else appears. And that something else is the free labourer. "Two very different kinds of commodity-possessors must come face to face and into contact; on the one hand, the owners of money, means of production, means of subsistence, who are eager to increase the sum of values they possess by buying other people's

realise it in the market later. This does not alter the fact that the merchant exploits his employees like the capitalist. He pays them the value of their labour-power and retains the surplus value which they create; the labour of transporting and storing commodities is, of course, included in the socially necessary labour which determines a commodity's value. (See Cahn's *Capital To-day*, p. 182.)

labour-power; on the other hand, free labourers, the sellers of their own labour-power and, therefore, the sellers of labour." We have seen how the merchants became the first kind of commodity-possessors. The creation of this other, also necessary, kind of commodity-possessor, this class of free labourers, will furnish a subject for the next Outline.

BOOKS:

Gibbins, Period III. (especially Chap. II., on Wool and Manufacture); Period IV., Chap. II.

Warner, Chaps. IX. and XI. *Capital*, Vol. I. Part VIII. for this and succeeding lessons. No economist but Marx has dealt fully with methods of accumulation.

Untermann's *Marxian Economics*. (Kerr, 5s.). Chaps. V., XI., and XVI.

Smith's *Wealth of Nations*, Book I., Chap. IV., contains information re origin and use of money; and Book III., Chaps. III. and IV., deal with the rise of commerce and towns. As also do

Gibbins' *Commerce in Europe* and 1st Chap. of Hobson's *Evolution of Capitalism*. (Scott Publishing Company, 6s.)

X.—THE CREATION OF THE PROLETARIAT

THE reader will recall that in Outline IX. it was shown how the merchants gathered together that accumulation which is the starting point of capital; and how, owing to their methods of accumulation, they were under the illusion that value was created in exchange.

If he has carefully read the chapters mentioned at the Outline's end—and he should do so—he will have gained some knowledge of the horrors which accompanied this primitive accumulation. He will have found that the Congo atrocities are not without precedents in this terrible story of meanness, of treachery, of bribery, of massacre, of the artificial creation of famines, and of wars for slaves and plunder. It is, indeed, a tale which "harrows up the soul." He will have an insight into things which no orthodox history-book will supply. He will know how the much-admired Elizabethan mariners were busy trading captured slaves for rum, and how Hawkins, in particular, as a mark of royal recognition of his gallant exploits in this trade, received from good Queen Bess a ship called *Jesus* to encourage him in his Christian enterprises. "The Knights of the Road never surpassed the Knights of Commerce at this romantic process of loot and murder." Yet, in spite of this, it is often maintained that the capitalist class owns its capital because of its practice of thrift and abstinence.

THE NECESSITY OF A PROLETARIAT.—Why does Capitalism need a class which has no other way of living than by the sale of its labour-power? To answer this question we must clearly understand what capital is. Capital is that part of wealth used with a view to profit, and, as we have tried to show, only emerges upon the stage when certain historical developments have occurred.

Preceding forms of capital—merchants' and usurers'

—did not create more value.* The merchant and usurer only transferred values from their different owners; if no commodities or exchange-values were produced then they (the trader and the moneylender) would be idle. That the merchant, by at first dealing in the surplus products of the community, initiated, increased and encouraged commodity-production is not denied. But we saw in the last lesson that the cheating and looting of the merchants and the extortion of the usurers, in former Empires, through causing internal divisions and corruption and external pressure, created their own Nemesis in the disappearance of their freemen customers and in foreign invasions.

This impossibility of regularly increasing values, except by the fresh expenditure of labour power, is thoroughly demonstrated by the Labour Theory of Value. "Labour," declared Petty, "is the father and active principle of wealth, lands are the mother." The accumulation of values was only potential capital until the serf and Guild relations had been destroyed, and a class of people—the free labourers—free from all the old regulations and owning only one particular commodity, labour-power, was forced to sell this commodity—thus supplying the labour-power without which capital cannot function. Industrial capital thus implies profit making by the appropriation of surplus value in the production of commodities.

We will now turn from the theoretical to the practical aspect and attempt to notice the facts in English history which helped to produce this necessary proletariat, and follow how the 15th century Golden Age of the labourer was swept away. Remembering the relativity of all beginnings, no attempt will be made at chronological exactness; and it should be clearly understood that the factors hereafter noted did not

* The word "value" is a more definite economic term than "wealth," because the latter may include natural wealth, in the making of which no human labour was expended, though the given definition of capital still holds good (as no person can use the wealth, for example, of a beautiful sunset to make more sunsets or wealth).

operate separately, but were in constant interplay aiding each other.

THE BREAK-UP OF THE FEUDAL BANDS.—As this point has already been dealt with in *The Fall of Feudalism*, we need not stop to describe how the policy of would-be absolute monarchs, the effects of war and new methods of war, and the growth of luxury and towns, combined to make the barons disband their retainers. Hitherto the number of his retainers was a criterion of the baron's wealth, but this standard was displaced in later years by another—the size of his rent-roll. The old lord of the manor, often residing in turn at his various manors and receiving labour services and rent in kind to provide for himself and his followers, made way for the new Court nobility and the absentee, money-rent receiving landlord. The fighting retainers became free-booters or sturdy beggars or flocked to the towns to find work.

THE CONFISCATION OF THE MONASTERIES.—With the decline of Feudalism the Church, the chief upholder of its traditions, was attacked. The curious, enterprising, daring spirit of the age flouted the Church with its blind reverence for the past and its obstinate retention of beliefs concerning the world which voyages and thinkers had proved untrue. Our next Outline will contain further particulars of how her prestige was destroyed, new methods of reasoning adopted, and of how the coming of printing and education broke down her monopoly of learning, which was the source of her power in a dark, superstitious age. Her insolence and greed for revenue, her damming up of wealth which otherwise might have financed new undertakings, her crowds of idle monks, her many sacred holidays, and her indiscriminate charity which prevented the poor from acquiring industrious habits—these were the causes of the Reformation. In 1534 England separated from Rome and in 1536 and 1539 the huge rental and lands of one thousand religious houses were confiscated. As the Church had owned one-fifth to one-third of the land of the country and

the new owners grew wool, this, for its serfs and dependents, was a serious matter. The monks, the Church's dependents, and the workers upon the Church's lands followed the way of the disbanded feudal retainers. This confiscation of religious property was also used to weaken the Guilds by taking from them that part of their funds left and used for religious purposes.

HIGH PRICES.—These, too, played a part in reducing the labourer from his former comparatively independent state. The opening-up of new supplies by the voyages of discovery and the resulting cheapening of the precious metals, in obedience to the law of value, caused prices to rise, and in the 16th century prices rose 100 per cent., while wages rose only 30 per cent. Another factor which raised prices and helped to lower the standard of the workers' conditions was the depreciation of the coinage, both in size and quality, indulged in by the early Tudor monarchs. Wages, then as now, only slowly followed the rising prices.

THE ENCLOSURES.—The dilemma of the landlord, caused by the shortage of labour following the Black Death, found a solution in the increase of wool-growing. At first the trouble was that no labour could be got; however, as wool-growing developed, the labourers and their holdings were in the way and their labour was no longer required. In the years 1540–1600, owing to the high prices obtainable for wool, the tendency to evict men for sheep was especially hastened. Beginning in a small way in the 13th century, the enclosure of land, in what had been practically a hedgeless country, was widely and rapidly adopted. The following figures will convey some idea of its extent and rate of increase in the 18th and the first half of the 19th centuries: In the years 1710 to 1760, 334,974 acres enclosed; in the years 1760 to 1843, 7,000,000 acres enclosed. The process was something like this:—The lord would first of all introduce sheep upon his demesne in order to escape paying high wages. Then he would enclose the waste and restrict the

tenants' arable. Next the common lands with all their privileges would be enclosed, and the labourer would find his very existence threatened with the disappearance of his common rights and of the demand for his labour, as few men were required to tend the sheep. The lord would no longer occupy the manor house; the peasants were evicted from their holdings, and, as they tilled their land in co-operation, when two or three of them were shifted it often meant the breaking up of the whole village. Thus the demolition of the feudal manor was accomplished.

Preventive legislation, in 1489, 1514, and 1534, seeking to prevent the turning of arable into pasture land, and to stop this wholesale destruction of villages, was ineffective because the magistrates' interests—they were landlords—were contrary to the laws they were supposed to administer. It cannot be denied that the abolition of the open field system was beneficial in many ways to agriculture. But the benefits were made at the expense of one class for the benefit of the other. Kett's Norfolk Revolt, in 1549, was an uprising of the peasants against the system of enclosures. The prosperity of the large landowners was the poverty of the peasants. The Golden Age became a memory.

VAGRANCY AND PAUPERISM.—These were two of the immediate results. Disbanded from the little feudal armies, robbed of the shelter, charity, and protection of the monasteries, evicted from their holdings, and deprived of the use of the common lands, these vagrants and robbers became a danger to society through their homelessness and desperation. This danger was at first met by making appeals through the parish clergymen to private charity, but in 1601 it was found necessary to make the first Poor Law. Pauperism became a recognised institution in society. This Poor Law, however, was the outcome of fear rather than of sympathy with the expropriated, for one of the Elizabethan statutes lays it down that "Lusty and valiant beggars" were to be "grievously whipped

and burned through the gristle of the right ear with an iron of the compass of an inch about" as a lasting sign of punishment. Before Elizabeth, in Henry VII.'s reign, we read that 72,000 thieves were hanged. In the time of the Stuarts the Law of Parochial Settlement was necessary, because no person likely to become chargeable upon the poor rate was allowed to settle in any parish but the one of his birth. The flocking to the towns of the dispossessed villagers helped to break down the Guild exclusiveness. The passing of the Statute of Apprentices reveals that trade was unregulated, and that apprenticeship was sometimes being evaded. Under this Act wages were often fixed so low by the magistrates that they had to be supplemented by grants under the Poor Law provisions. So with the coming of the "free" class, "free" from all its former security of subsistence, comes the problem of poverty and the "freedom" to starve. The sad and bitter story of the creation of his own class merits the attention of every thoughtful worker.

THE RISE OF THE MANUFACTORY.—The divorce from the means of production is now complete. Like the two very necessary poles of a magnet, accumulated values now face labour-power. The Guilds and their regulations are undermined, and the vagrants are ready to be disciplined in the army of production by the rise of the manufactory, which first took place in the woollen industry. Long before the Industrial Revolution, while many industries were still in the Guild and domestic stages of production, in the textile industry men were assembled under the single roof of the factory, where, under careful supervision, the division of labour inside the workshop was introduced. From this came a simplifying and a division of operations, paving the way for an application of machinery, and increasing the productiveness of labour.

In closing this Outline, in which we have tried to show the harsh circumstances which accompanied the birth of our class, we would make it clear that we have no desire to provoke useless regrets. To rhapsodise

sentimentally over the sufferings of the early members of our class, to wish things had been otherwise, or to imagine what might have been, is a waste of mental energy.

The moving finger writes, and, having writ,
 Moves on: nor all thy piety nor wit
 Shall lure it back to cancel half a line,
 Nor all thy tears wash out a word of it.

The enclosures improved agriculture by eliminating waste; they also broke down the narrow outlook of the peasant proprietor and so made for progress.

Again, though Capitalism found it necessary to divorce the labourer from the means of production, by ways more vigorous than kind, before it could emerge and play its part upon the stage of history, we shall see in future lessons how in its progress it developed immense natural resources; solved the problem of production; brought the whole world into kinship; tended, and is still tending, to break down all barriers of craft, sex, colour and nationality between the workers; and is gradually drilling and educating us up to the point of control of industry.

By strenuous agitation, education in the social sciences in order to solve the problem of distribution, and by efficient organisation, that time can be hastened when the separation traced above will be annulled, and the labourer will be again the owner and controller of the now highly improved means of production.

BOOKS:

Capital, Vol. I., Chaps. XXVII. and XXVIII. (These contain a description of the expropriation of the peasants and the succeeding legislation.)

Gibbins, Period III., Chap. I; Period IV., Chaps. I. to IV.

Warner, Chaps. VIII. and X.

Value, Price and Profit (S.L.P., 6d.) and *Wage-Labour, and Capital* (S.L.P., 3d.). Show need of free labourers to Capitalism.

Hammond's *Village Labourer*. (Longmans, 10s.). Contains ample details of the second wave of Enclosures (1760-1832).

XI.—THE RENAISSANCE FROM MEDIÆVAL NIGHT

THE breadth and depth of this subject forbid its adequate treatment in a single Outline. The fact that this Re-awakening movement has never stopped, and that daily new specialities and sub-divisions of the sciences are being made, compel us to make only a brief general survey of it. To trace technical progress in any one of the sciences born in the Renaissance would fill ponderous tomes. Therefore, only a few of the most striking contrasts between the ideas of the Middle Ages and of modern times will be given, leaving the reader to follow this re-birth upon a fuller scale for himself. This movement—in which “man discovered himself and the world anew”—is also here viewed, not as an English, but as a European, a world advance.

Contradictory descriptions of the Dark Ages exist. Some historians have told us romantic tales about the time when chivalry flourished and knights were bold, and when the monks tended the flickering flame of culture and learning. Others paint a different picture: “The Middle Ages was a period of bestial ignorance, raping knights, robber troubadours, and fine ladies who never changed their underclothing.”

PREVIOUS ADVANCES IN LEARNING.—As the name implies the Re-naissance was the re-birth, not the birth of learning. Greek thought mightily influenced the world. Naturally a great deal of this can be traced back to the earlier civilisations of Egypt and Chaldea which flourished as early as 10,000 B.C., leaving behind them in pyramid and sphinx, clay bricks and cylinder records, broken statues and ruins the tokens of their greatness. Farther and farther back the past is rolled by the investigators and yet the scroll is not exhausted. In Greece that necessary leisure—without which learning is impossible—was secured by slave-labour. The Greeks, almost as soon as they are known to

history, had left behind them their Homeric mythology. It is an interesting task to notice how the introspection of Socrates and the vague idealism of Plato followed the vain attempts of Thales, Anaxagoras, Heraclitus, Empedocles and many others to explain the origin of the universe and its inhabitants. They failed because they lacked the knowledge which specialisation and centuries of observation in the sciences were to bring.

But these philosophers made some clever guesses at the truth. 2,400 years before Kant, Anaximander rightly conjectured the nature of the heavenly bodies. Democritus anticipated the Atomic Theory only established by Dalton in 1803; and Empedocles and Heraclitus perceived that "Nothing is; everything is becoming," long before Hegel adopted it and Darwin furnished such a striking proof of it in biology in 1859.

It was a little later in history, in the city of Alexandria, that science began. The library attached to the famous Alexandrian Museum contained 400,000 volumes; an additional library also had 300,000. 14,000 students met in the city. Strenuous efforts were made, and no expense was spared, to collect, increase and diffuse knowledge. Here Aristarchus forestalled the later findings of Copernicus. Here Euclid formulated his well-known propositions. Archimedes, the famous mathematician and inventor, was influenced by his residence in this intellectual metropolis. Hipparchus, with his astronomical tables, and Ptolemy, with his 13 standard books on astronomy, only displaced nearly 1,500 years later by Newton's work, gathered in Alexandria their observations and knowledge. And these names are only examples drawn at random from a lengthy list of famous thinkers and discoverers in many branches of science who tried to solve the riddles of Nature in the shadow of that famous museum, unluckily burnt during Julius Cæsar's siege of the town.

Turning to Rome in its cosmopolitan days, we find the oracles neglected; the gods left to look after themselves; and full liberty of thought allowed to all sects if

they did not endanger the State or disturb others with their vigorous proselytising, as did the Christians and the Jews. Finally Christianity triumphed, became the State religion, and the Papacy, which Hobbes described as "the ghost of the deceased Roman Empire sitting crowned upon the grave thereof," was evolved. But before the latter development had happened, such scenes as the murder of Hypatia, the destruction of books of science, and the closing of the schools, had occurred. "Christianity proscribed philosophy, abolished the schools, and plunged the world into an abyss of darkness from which it only emerged after twelve hundred years." Inquiry was soon thought to be a sin; to doubt was to be damned; and the Bible was made the final authority on all questions.

As we shall deal later with the economic causes behind the Re-awakening, it should be here stated that *this intellectual reaction was not caused by the introduction of any particular creed or system of thought, but it was an inevitable concomitant of the invasion of Europe by folk in a lower state of economic development, who later instituted the Feudal System.* Fighting predominated over thinking.

CONTRASTS.—In the Dark Ages the world was thought to be flat; the sky fitted it like an inverted basin in which went to and fro the sun and moon and stars, thus providing man, the centre and the crown of creation, with light. Above the sky was heaven, and below the earth was hell. One ingenious explanation of night was that the sun disappeared behind a big mountain.

The stars and the earth's shape and position were the first things to attract the attention of thinkers. The revolution in thought, begun by Copernicus about 1507, proved the truth of the heliocentric theory, and revealed that our earth is only a minute speck of dust among countless larger worlds, "pinnacled dim in the immense inane." "Worlds," writes Draper, "are scattered like dust in vast abysses of space." Measured by the velocity of light, the nearest star is distant three

years and 83 days. Man could no longer be considered as the reason why the sun yielded heat and light. The world could not be flat after sailors had proved the horizon endless.

Astronomy is thus the oldest science. In Egypt the appearance of certain stars and the overflowings of the Nile were noticed to coincide. In our own country even the builders of Stonehenge had watched the movements of the sun and stars to some purpose. Especially in the clearer southern skies, the stars at night would serve as a guide to the early desert and ocean travellers, and thus, by reason of their utility, excite interest. The age, formation, and motion of the earth also provided fields of study and controversy. Ideas now found in children's lesson books were denounced fiercely by the Church as being heretical. There were contradictory estimates of the earth's age based upon the scriptural records, but they all agreed that she was not more than 6,000 years old, and that she had been made in a week.

The abandonment of these ideas is recent history. Geology destroys "the lie on the lips of the priest," and gives evidence of the earth's remote origin and formation in a period requiring myriads of centuries. The Time call answers the Space call. We now know that man himself is about a quarter of a million years old, and is a part of the animal kingdom, whose existence goes back even further.

We have difficulty in realising the dense ignorance of a time when ascetics, to glorify their religion, broke off the highest of human relations, and in deep solitude became dirtier than the beasts; when the churches were filled with terror-stricken, praying crowds at the appearance of the comets; and when, while the Saracens in Spain and Africa had raised science, hygiene, drainage and street-paving to a high level, Europe, wallowing in ignorance, had none of these things. But in time, personal and public cleanliness and efficient drainage were found to be better preventives against plagues than prayers; sickness and

lunacy were not ascribed to the workings of evil spirits and to demoniacal possession (though Luther, living as late as he did, strongly believed in devils); and a thousand and one improvements, such as glass windows and chimneys, were made in the dwellings of the people with beneficial results. Gone are the ferocious punishments for crime, the trials by ordeal, the horrors of the Inquisition—the thoughts of which still provoke a shudder—the burnings and drownings of men and women as wizards and witches, the ruthless means by which inquiry was suppressed, and the absurd worship of relics. The Renaissance was the dawn of commonsense.

NEW METHODS OF REASONING.—Hitherto reasoning had been largely deductive in its method—*i.e.*, reasoning from the theory to that of facts. General principles whose truth no one was allowed to question had been used to explain particular facts—often in a ludicrous manner. Bacon's name and book, *Novum Organon*, are associated with the revival of the inductive method in England. This was just the opposite to the deductive. The facts displace the theory in importance. The tendency of the mind to rashly generalise and to let its wishes influence its thoughts and beliefs is under this method of reasoning restrained. All the facts must be observed carefully before the generalisation is made, and with new facts may come the revision of the theory or generalisation. This is the method of science. For science corrects the evidence of the senses; probes beneath the superficial; preserves an alert and critical mind; ignores the mysterious and the miraculous; and is always willing to recast her generalisations if they do not agree with the facts. It was the growth of this scientific spirit which, armed with telescope, microscope, spectroscope, barometer, thermometer, chemical balance and other tools, was later to have such wonderful results; and which broke up the torpor, credulity and ignorance of the mediæval mind.

THE CAUSES OF THE AWAKENING.—What, then, was the cause behind this awakening, which gradually sub-

stituted reason for revelation, and caused men to carefully observe and interrogate Nature in all her phases; and which revived the study of the ancient manuscripts which had so long been neglected. Many reasons have been given as to why the Church's power declined until she was no longer able to preserve her unity of belief by burning the folk who dissented therefrom; why innumerable improvements of civilisation were introduced into Europe; and why anatomy, with its dissection of the human body, ignoring the theologian's fears of difficulties arising on the resurrection morning, was adopted with other sciences which have sought to banish disease and pain rather than to treat them as necessary evils.*

The fall of Constantinople (1453) drove the remnants of the ancient culture west, chiefly to the Italian towns, which, it should be noted, were significantly not only the centres of trade, but also of learning. The economic cause behind the Crusades, and their effects upon Europe in bringing her into touch with the more highly developed Saracens, have already been traced. Not only were "the plugged-up trade routes" the cause of the Crusades, but they made it imperative that another way to the East should be discovered, and were thus the cause of those voyages which had such immense results in widening the trading area, in creating an adventurous spirit of inquiry, and in destroying old ideas concerning the world.

To sum up briefly, we would say that these new ideas betoken the rise of a new class. The conflict between the darkness of Mediævalism and the light of the Renaissance was *the ideological counterpart of the growing conflict between the decaying Feudal System (with its chief support, the Church) and the rising commercial*

* Lecky, in Chap. IV. of his *History of European Morals* (Watts, 2s.), writes:—"Not till the education of Europe passed from the monasteries to the universities, not till Mohammedan science and classical free thought and industrial independence broke the sceptre of the Church did the intellectual revival of Europe begin."

class. Both gunpowder and printing—the latter a munition works of mental high explosives—helped on the passing of Feudalism. Gunpowder itself implies some knowledge of the nature of charcoal, sulphur, nitre and other matter, and as new ideas were generalised from facts the Press gave them a wide circulation.

In order that old traditions and authorities should be shattered and individualism developed, science, ever the handmaid of the rising class, was employed. The Industrial Revolution (to be treated of later) was no chance happening. Who can imagine it happening without the development of physics and chemistry? Think of the intimate connection between mining and geology—and these are only stray examples. Yet all these sciences have their roots in the spirit born in the Renaissance.

The powers of reaction, whose chief representative in the period under notice was the Church, fluttered like a moth at the light of the Re-awakening; but all in vain. From Hypatia to Ferrer the Church has punished the sin of inquiry whenever she has been powerful enough to do so. The vituperation with which the Evolution Theory was hailed has hardly yet died away; yet, we have in our own times intellectual slovenliness, cloudy mysticism, a desire to linger in the furnished lodgings of tradition, and attempts to square science with religion, encouraged by the reactionary forces of the capitalist class—once a ruthless opponent of mediæval mysticism, but now wishing to preserve things as they are.

“The tide of battle which turned at the Renaissance has never suffered a set-back.” Modern industry is the embodiment of rationalism. Confident in truth, science has no need to persecute and crucify its enemies; break its opponents upon the wheel of torture; or burn them at the stake. Endeavour to recall what tremendous benefits in her short 300 years of life she has brought to mankind, and who will say what she will not do in the next 300 years?

The capitalist class found it necessary in their rise to power to develop the natural sciences and consciously control the natural forces. It is common knowledge too that this science, this control over nature, is now prostituted to destructive purposes; that safety inventions for life are disregarded for profit's sake. But, just as in the natural sciences astrology preceded astronomy, alchemy—with its vain search for the elixir of endless life and for the philosopher's stone with the Midas touch—preceded chemistry, and Genesis preceded *The Origin of Species* in biology, so, in the social sciences, Ideal Socialism came before Scientific Socialism. In the development of the latter a conscious control of the social forces will be won; the benefits resulting from past improvements will no longer be unequally shared; and the re-awakening of the scientific spirit, the theme of this Outline, will be continued and applied in regions hitherto untouched. The working class, when it so desires, can reap the heritage of the past and be "the crowning race of those who eye to eye shall look on knowledge. At whose command is Earth and Earth's. And in whose hand is Nature like an open book."

BOOKS:

Reading a little more general than our usual text-books is needed to appreciate the cause and significance of the Renaissance. The works of Lecky, Draper, White and others contain much information upon the subject.

Professor Bury's *History of Freedom of Thought* (H. U. L., 2s.) is a handy little book for those who lack the time and money for larger works.

Charles Reade's *The Cloister and the Hearth* (Everyman Series, Dent, 2s.), besides being an interesting novel, gives a good idea of the credulity and ignorance which prevailed before the printing press existed.

Two books summing up the position in a general popular fashion from a Socialist viewpoint are Arthur M. Lewis' *Struggle between Science and Superstition*, and Untermann's *Science and Revolution* (Kerr and Co., 2s. 6d.).

Engels' *Socialism: Utopian and Scientific* (Preface) relates briefly the Marxian philosophy to the great English thinkers of this time.

XII.—THE BEGINNINGS OF MODERN CAPITALISM

IN the preceding Outline we turned aside to notice the cause, extent, and effect, of that intellectual re-awakening known as the Renaissance. The reader will remember that in the two previous lessons the accumulation of values by the merchants and the creation of the proletariat occupied our attention. At the risk of repetition, and before taking up the thread of development, we would again emphasise the impossibility of considering Modern or Industrial Capitalism apart from these historical conditions of its birth.

THE GENERAL NATURE OF CAPITALISM.—Capitalism or commodity production is not eternal; neither has the money relation always existed, as to-day, when practically everything has its price—*i.e.*, its money expression of exchange value. To recapitulate: Exchange begat money; money begat capital, which is money used to make more money. Merchant's capital functions in circulation, aiming to buy products cheap and sell dear. The usurer lent money, trading in one thing only, in order to receive later a larger sum in return.* Industrial Capital, which did not exist in England before the 16th century, unlike these preceding types, functions not in circulation but in production. While merchant's capital indirectly exploited independent producers, industrial capital directly exploits producers who are dependent upon it. Therefore modern capital cannot have a beginning before there is a working-class dependent upon it for wages as the only way in which this class can live. Now wages are the price of *labour-power* and not of labour; the former is a commodity, the latter is not. (It is the difference between a faculty and a function, or the exercise of that faculty; between an eye and seeing, or an ear and hearing.) The importance of this distinction

* The modern use of the word "capital" ignores these older forms.

is recognised when it is understood that labour-power is the only peculiar commodity which in its consumption or exercise creates more than its value. The difference between the wages or price paid the worker for his labour-power and (after making allowance for the other necessary materials, machinery and such like) the price received by the capitalist when he sells the products of labour, is what is known in Marxian Economics as surplus value, which is the source of all rent, profit, and interest. Hoping that enough has been said to attract the reader to study "the dismal (?) science," "Economics," and to find out what a commodity is, and what measures its exchange-value, it is sufficient for us to note here that the production of surplus value, which the capitalist calls profit, is the primary motive and stimulus of capitalist production.

GUILD PRODUCTION.—A glance at former systems of production will help us to follow the beginnings of Capitalism. When, under Feudalism, industries first arose in the towns of England, they were controlled by the Guilds. The rise and fall of the Guilds were traced in Outline VII., and pp. 29 and 30 of the text-book (Gibbins) should be re-read. The breaking down of the local markets and the degeneration of the Guilds into close corporations demanded a new method of organisation.

DOMESTIC PRODUCTION.—Though finer cloths were still imported from abroad, we read, even as early as the first half of the 14th century, of a manufacture of coarse cloth in England under the domestic system. But later, in the 15th century, England exported cloth in ever-increasing quantities. Thus the weavers broke away from the Guilds first. Instead of completely controlling the industry, the workmen, perhaps with an apprentice or journeyman, working at home, were supplied with their raw material by middlemen, who also took the finished product off their hands, either to sell it for use or pass it on through the next process as the occasion required. The worsted of the Eastern

counties, the broadcloths, of the West, and the special manufactures of the North, were made and exported under this system of production in the 16th century. Though we see various attempts being made to introduce the manufactory system, the domestic system lasted in many industries right throughout the 17th century and on into the 18th; and its doom was only finally sealed by the Industrial Revolution. The rural nature of domestic production is revealed by the complaints of the towns against the infringements of their monopolies of trade by "divers persons dwelling in the hamlets, thorps and villages." Many of these producers were engaged in agriculture in addition to their manufacture.

The rapid development of the old and the rise of new industries cannot be understood apart from the influence exerted upon England by the immigration of the Flemings and the Huguenots. Spain, by her persecutions in Holland in the 16th century, supplied her bitter rival with an invaluable supply of craftsmen and, incidentally, destroyed the chief market for her own wool. The Huguenots came later. "Between 1670 and 1690, 80,000 persons came to England." The silk industry received a special impetus; and the manufacture of sail-cloth and tapestry, the art of paper-making, glass-making and watch-making and other industries were introduced. France's loss was England's gain.

Defoe's description of the domestic system is quoted by Gibbins on p. 148. Capital under this system has been said to have been in its propagandist stage. More and more the middleman tended to become the employer of the domestic producers. We see this by the rise of a new system which, in the 17th and 18th centuries, became a rival of the one now under consideration.

THE MANUFACTORY.—Gibbins, speaking of this transition, says:—

"It was becoming increasingly the custom to employ a large number of workpeople together under one roof, or at least

under the direction and supervision of one great manufacturer." (And, again, on p. 155, he says):—"At first the weaver had furnished himself with warp and weft, worked it up and brought it to the market himself; but by degrees the system grew too cumbersome, and the yarn was given out by merchants to the weaver, and at last the merchant got together a certain number of looms in a town or village, and worked them under his own supervision."

In the Tudor period many industrial villages sprang up outside the old towns in order to escape the Guild restrictions. The Weaver's Act of 1555 endeavoured to restrain this tendency by restricting the number of looms and apprentices that one man might have, but its effects were not lasting.

At first the difference between the labour of the Guild and of the manufactory was only quantitative. But soon it would differ in quality also; composite labour became detail. The labourer performed one operation and used one special tool. The finished commodity represented not the labour of an individual, but of a group. This paved the way for the next system of production, which began about 1780.

MACHINUFACTURE.—This hardly comes within "the beginnings" of modern Capitalism, and it will be treated fully in Outline XV., when the Industrial Revolution is our subject. However, it will be understood that the division of operations, and the simplification and specialisation of tools, in the manufactory, made possible the application of machinery driven by hitherto unused natural forces. The Industrial Revolution was the result of 200 years of evolution. While the worker, even inside the factory, was a craftsman, he still retained much of his independence; but soon the machine became more important than the man who became its servant. Manufacture began to make changes with the labourer, but machinofacture began with his tools. The class which was rich enough to become the owners of these new means of production was not the small producers, for they had not the means of purchase, and their domestic system was

destroyed by this new rival, but that class of commercial capitalists, who were wealthy, and who now seized their opportunity to become capitalists proper.

FROM STATE REGULATION TO LAISSEZ-FAIRE.—Sufficient has been said to show how gradually the rise of Capitalism took place; how, by foreign and home trade, it made the old systems of production inadequate; and how its power over the producers increased until it had snapped all the old relations and made the producers its dependents. About the time of Elizabeth, accumulation had proceeded far enough for industrial capital to commence. Owing to the increase of the precious metals, capital was fluid, and owing to enclosures and other factors, labour was fluid too, and free from all the old ties. The East India Company, founded about this time, was different from former companies in that it was a joint stock company. Hitherto merchants had adventured with their own money; now capital began to be more impersonal and divorced from its owners, and later capitalists exercised their "directive ability" in receiving cheques, while their "abstinence" was from work.

In dealing with Mercantile Economy we found that State monopoly and regulation of trade and production were used by the early commercial capitalist class. Like a child, it needed artificial aid. Bacon voiced the spirit of his age when he laid it down that the State should ever be active in "the opening and well-balancing of trade, the cherishing of manufactures, the banishing of idleness, the repressing of waste and excess by sumptuary laws, the improving and husbanding of the soil, and the regulating of prices."

Out of the break-up of the little self-sufficient feudal manors and the decay of Guild production, owing to its inability to supply the wider market now developed, came the idea of the nation as a trading and industrial unit. The local market, with its narrow parochial outlook, in which the town was everything, made way for the national market; nationalism had its beginning and the realm was set above the town. In the next

Outline it will be seen how this feeling encouraged the growth of an absolute monarchy in close touch with trading interests. However, at this time national industries were protected and encouraged; English shipping was fostered by Navigation Acts; foreign imports were taxed and home exports increased in the hope of keeping the balance of trade in our favour by dumping our goods upon the foreigner; "Colonies were estates to be exploited for the benefit of the Mother-Country"—a process against which the Americans rebelled; no country was allowed to deal with another's colonies; and trade followed the flag.

But there came a time when Capitalism could walk alone without these aids; when home industries needed no protection and the benefits of free and unregulated trade were proclaimed; when colonies were looked upon as "white elephants," and competition and the law of supply and demand were thought to satisfactorily fix prices; when other "natural" laws were adopted; and when restrictions of all kinds were regarded as injurious and a policy of *laissez-faire* or "go as you please" was adopted. In the world market now opened the flag was not necessary to trade. The first warlike period of Capitalism was followed by the peaceful period.

It was in Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations* that these new feelings found expression. Issued in 1776, the book at once attracted notice, and by its attacks upon the absurdities of monopolies and restrictions, hastened the death of the mercantile notions. The Repeal of the Corn Laws in 1846 was the final triumph of the policy therein advocated. In his book the benefits of the division of labour were shown, and it was maintained that men, in following their own individual self-interest, would thus greatly benefit the whole community. One writer summarised the doctrine as follows:—"Man's self-love is God's Providence." But long before the protective tariffs were removed these theories were used to make combination of the workers a crime. The "night watchman" State did not

remain inactive against the worker when he was forced to deny the "natural" laws which justified his isolation and damnation.

The full maturity of Capitalism and its effects upon the workers are outside the present Outline. Enough here to notice that by the beginning of the 18th century Capitalism in its manufacturing stage is already equipped with a Credit System and a National Debt, the latter, of course, owned collectively, being especially useful in spreading the cost of wars over centuries and providing a sure investment for wealth possessors. The restraints which had to be placed upon the effects of *laissez-faire* and rampant individualism will also receive future attention.

WARS FOR MARKETS AND EMPIRES.—Marx speaks about "the commercial war of the European nations, with the globe for a theatre, treading upon the heels of the idyllic proceedings which signalised the rosy dawn of the era of capitalist production." Gibbins (Chap. V., Period IV.) shows very clearly the commercial nature of the wars of the 17th and 18th centuries. Time, the father of Truth, has enabled him to see deeper reasons for these wars than religious animosity and the cutting off of Captain Jenkins' ear. And it must be remembered that commercial supremacy in that period meant industrial supremacy. Markets were won before they were supplied. England fought for "her place in the sun" against her older-established rivals, Spain, Portugal, and Holland. It is common knowledge how the Elizabethan mariners determined to have a share in the plunder of the New World, and how Spain, irritated by these attempts, dispatched the Armada. Luckily "God blew with His winds and they were scattered."

Cromwell declared war not only against Spain, but also against Holland. The latter war was continued after the Restoration.* Holland failed through lack

* "From 1650 to 1674," writes Townsend Warner, "the Dutch were our 'natural enemies,' and the furious fighting in the Channel

of economic staying power, and the battle was left to the two larger rivals, France and England. The reader can furnish himself with details of the 18th century wars from the chapters given, and these later wars were not only for trade but for occupation as well; he will discover by what means Canada, India, Australia, New Zealand, and the Cape were won, and why so much of the world's map is painted red. The end of the 18th century, after many wars, saw England the supreme colonial power of the world, the victor of the seas; and the owner of immense markets requiring goods. The resulting Industrial Revolution thus originated and thus stimulated will be dealt with after we have seen how the growth of economic power, which we have here traced, reflected itself upon the political field.

between Blake, Monk, and the Duke of York on the one side, and Von Tromp and De Ruyter on the other, was really a struggle for the carrying trade and dominion in the East. Chatham said later that he would conquer America in Germany, but it might have been said with equal truth that in the end of the 17th century we were warring for the East Indies in the Channel."

BOOKS:

Gibbins: the whole of Period IV. should be carefully studied for full details, missing from this general Outline, of the growth of mining, iron, pottery, weaving, cotton, and other industries, of the growing volume of trade, and of how these developments reacted upon agriculture.

Beard's *Industrial Revolution* (George Allen and Unwin, 1s. 6d.), Chap. I., gives a good survey in small compass of the period prior to 1760.

Warner, Chaps. XI. and XVIII., for similar details, and Chap. XIV. for 18th century trade wars.

Marx, Vol. I., Chap. XXXI., *Genesis of the Industrial Capitalist*.
Boudin, *Socialism and War* (5s. through the Plebs League) for foreign policy and trade wars.

XIII.—THE POLITICAL STRUGGLE OF THE
CAPITALIST CLASS

WE believe that this lesson—apparently a digression from our proper subject—will prove to be valuable in showing how the middle-class captured the reins of political power and dominated the State for itself when it was powerful enough to do so; and it used, and still uses, the State (*i.e.*, “the executive committee of the ruling class”) to protect and strengthen its economic interests. The liberty from the old feudal restrictions needed by the newer commercial and industrial class inevitably brought it into conflict with the political structure suitable to the old. Then, as now, industry and politics were acting and reacting upon each other. Economic development gave rise to new political ideas and made necessary the control of the political machinery by the newer interests in order to safeguard the already attained rights and to hasten *future* expansion.

ALLIED TO MONARCHY.—Under Feudalism the barons maintained their rights by their swords. The tribute they paid to their overlord, the king, was composed more of services than of money. They held their lands only on the definite condition that they assisted the king in war. The Magna Charta (1215), the so-called “keystone of English liberty,” was wrung from the king by their taking up arms against him. In the light of after events, it is of interest to note that the barons at one time seriously contemplated substituting for their reigning monarch a foreign prince. No such thing as a Parliament with regular sittings existed under Feudalism. An occasional assembly was held by the king and his lords, who made and administered the law in the assemblies and manor courts which, it will be remembered, superseded the mark-moot and shire-moot of pre-feudal times.

The decay of the feudal barons has already been described. Their extermination in internal and external warfare, the breaking up of their bands of retainers and the growth of the power of the king and the towns helped to create a new servile nobility which was completely dependent upon kingly favour for its land, which had in many cases been taken from the monasteries. In their little book, Morris and Bax describe the process thus:—

It was the interest of the towns to favour the growth of power in the king or monarch, since he was far off, and his domination was much less real and much less vexatious than that of the feudal neighbour, their immediate lord. The king, on his side, always engaged in disputes with his baronage, found his interest in creating and supporting free corporations in the towns, and thereby curbing the over-weening power of his vassals, while at the same time the growing production of the towns added to his exchequer by creating a fresh source of supply, easier to exploit than that which the military nobles yielded.

So, in time, the old feudal domains were welded together in a new political unit—the nation. The power of the Church and the might of the barons were gradually belittled. The rising commercial class were in close alliance with the kings. Ideas of a national market and trade came into being, and they were encouraged by the three Edwards in the 13th and 14th centuries. It was at this time that Parliament was formed. In 1295 the model Parliament of future times was held. To this Edward I., following the example of Simon de Montfort in 1265, called not only the barons, the knights of the shire and the Church prelates, but also two citizens from each city, and two burgesses from each borough. The citizens, the burgesses and the knights were, unlike the others, elected. At first called only for the purpose of finding money for the King, its sittings lasting only a few days, Parliament had secured by the end of the 14th century the right and control of taxation, and on two occasions deposed kings.

However, the destruction of the barons in "the bloody faction fights known as the Wars of the Roses," weakened the feudal section of Parliament, and in the 16th century we get a new type of monarchy, which dominated Parliament. Henry VII. and Henry VIII., with their tools, Wolsey and Thomas Cromwell, are examples of this new type. Under Elizabeth, the last of the Tudors, was developed a perfervid nationalism begotten of national commerce and unity, and manifesting itself in literature.

THE DISRUPTION OF THE ALLIANCE.—The alliance between the commercial class and an absolute monarchy was but a fleeting one. Paternal government and the divine right of kings became obsolete. To quote again the writers above referred to:—

The king, Charles I., aimed at completing the monarchical absolutism begun by the Tudors, while at the same time his course was clearer to him, because the old feud between nobles and king had quite died out and the nobles, from being powerful and often refractory feudal vassals, had become mere courtiers whose aims and interest were identified with those of the monarch. On the other side stood the bourgeoisie, who had thriven enormously on the growing commerce, were becoming powerful, and aiming not merely at social and economic freedom, but also at supremacy in the State. To the bourgeoisie also adhered the yeomen and the major part of the country squires, to which group Cromwell himself belonged.

The struggle thus caused by the growing economic development of the new class had its political and religious phases. Should King or Parliament rule? was the question to be decided. Slowly and timorously, with much harking back to 14th century precedents, the middle-class advocates assailed the King's prerogative, which even Bacon, among many other inferior thinkers, had glorified and accepted as rational. But the effects of the Reformation on the Continent and the New Learning made men less in awe of tradition and authority. The situation became more difficult until the middle class decided that tyranny gave the right of rebellion. A monarchy unable to defend

English commerce against the Dutch, and which by Star Chamber methods had absurd rights over the persons and possession of its subjects, and which restricted trade by granting monopolies, such an institution had to go. The alliance terminated in revolt. "Law and order" were abandoned for a while at necessity's bidding. The Civil War began in August, 1642, and after much hesitation—and only by the iron firmness of Cromwell and his proletarian followers—was it ended in January, 1649, by the execution of the King. This was followed by a four years' Republic, a seven years' Protectorate, and then the landlords and the capitalists coalesced, and the reaction found expression in the Restoration.

The disturbing effect of this transition is mirrored in the intellectual ferment of this period. Old ideas went into the melting-pot. About this time, for example, Hobbes tried to prove that the State was based on human needs rather than on heavenly ordinances; the Sects had their commencement, and the Quakers, the Fifth Monarchy men and the Levellers each revived old ideas or originated new ones. The Communist Diggers and the Levellers represented the proletarian element in the Revolution, who went further in their demands than the middle-class wished to go.

Some comment on Puritanism—the religious phase of the struggle—may be of interest. The religion of Feudalism, with its collective salvation and easy-going ways, did not suit the "business needs" of the new class, and so there arose beliefs which, being concerned more with the next world, interfered less with this. Capitalism could not thrive while men were thriftless, improvident, and spoilt by Church holidays and charity. Thrift, self-denial, prudence, diligence, simplicity, and such like—these are the virtues of Puritanism, very necessary to the small capitalist. As Craik puts it: "Puritanism is essentially a mental outlook belonging to the infancy of the accumulation of capital." At that time the possessor of such virtues

could become a capitalist himself. But now thrift is not so necessary; the day of the small capitalist is gone; thanks to the solving of the problem of production, opportunity now exists for self-expression rather than repression and self-denial; the fear of scarcity has been largely overcome; and the practice of these virtues is now reserved for the workers. Puritanism is in its decadence.*

Returning, however, to political development, we find that, though the rebellion apparently failed, things were not the same. Nothing could revive the Anglican reverence for the monarchy among the people who had seen a king beheaded. The Non-conformist industrial class helped to increase religious and political liberty. The open debauchery of the Court helped to bury for ever the divinity of kings.

THE TRIUMPH.—Any history book will supply an account of the events which culminated in the bloodless revolution of 1688, when Parliament asserted its supremacy by making a king of its own, calling in a Hollander in the person of William III. for the purpose. Henceforth the monarchy is no longer absolute, but limited. The revolutionary tide in England did not sweep high enough to wash away entirely the relics of Feudalism; but the House of Commons made good its control over money affairs.

The commercial and landed classes combined to form the Whig and Tory parties. An obsolete franchise made Parliament the representative of patrons and a few corporations. Power was concentrated in the hands of a few Whig families and in smaller affairs the landlord J.P. was supreme. The party system of government began. Mention has been made of the founding of the Bank of England (1694) and the National Debt (1693) with all its immense results; of the trade wars of the 18th century; of the effects of a pursual of the mercantile policy in our dealings with

* See Meilly's *Puritanism* (Kerr and Co., 2s. 6d.) for special treatment of this subject.

other nations, and of how Adam Smith and others attacked this policy in the latter half of the century.

This brings us to the Industrial Revolution. Its political effects will alone be noticed. Hitherto agriculture and manufacture had been on equal terms, but the Industrial Revolution secured the predominance of industry, and premier place to the manufacturing interest. The industrial classes wished to translate this economic power into political power, and hence we have the agitation for franchise reform. This demand was only satisfied in the Reform Bill of 1832, which attempted to destroy the corrupt pocket-boroughs of the landed proprietors. Previous to its passing, villages with 50 inhabitants had elected two members, and the ploughed fields of Old Sarum, which gave seven votes, which elected two members (in a tent which had to be erected for the returning officer), is a well-known example of the former state of affairs. The Reform Bill, with its £10 occupier clause, put the power in the hands of the middle class and paved the way for later improvements.

USES OF THE STATE AND ITS END.—In confirmation of the thesis laid down in the introduction to this Outline, history informs us as to the attempts made, from the Statute of Labourers (1349) to the Combination Acts (1799), by the ruling class to force down wages, prevent association, and lengthen the working day through the power of the State. It will be our task to consider some of this (and later) legislation, when dealing with the rise of the Trade Unions. The 10th Chapter of Marx's *Capital*, especially Sections VI. and VII., should be consulted on the lengthening and shortening of the working day; while the 28th Chapter furnishes details of the Poor Laws, and of the legislation directed against vagabondage and attempting to force down wages.

The fact that, between 1688 and 1845, 4,016 Acts were passed to enclose 6,320,426 acres, gives us another example of legislation benefiting the class-owning political power and having, in this case, adverse effects upon the small peasant class, politically weak.

The Corn Bounties are another example of the expression of economic interests. They were put into force for the sake of the landed interest, and their later repeal signalises the victory of the newer industrial interest.* Our modern legislation, in the higher value which it places upon money and property than upon life, betrays its class origin.

Thus, while agreeing that economic power precedes political power and that laws are powerless to restrain economic development, it can be maintained that the power of the State has been used to strengthen and fortify the power of the dominant class. Economic antagonisms are reflected in politics. The essential *class* nature of the State should be, however, clearly understood; denying that, we cannot appreciate the true purpose and method of labour organisation. The State is the public power of coercion used by the rulers to keep the ruled in order. It was made necessary by the antagonism which arose when society became divided into classes, and it will become unnecessary when the working class become the ruling class and there will be no dispossessed class needing coercion and restraint in the name of law and order. When its function disappears, when "political government gives way to industrial administration," then the State is no longer wanted. It will be replaced by the administrative framework of the producers' organisations. Whether Westminster will be used, as William Morris prophesied, to store dung is another matter; but certainly we shall arrive at that condition when, like an Indian chief, we shall be able to behave ourselves without the aid of the policeman's baton or the hangman's rope. Those who in their intricate schematisations of the future retain the word "State," robbed of all its historical character, to represent the organised con-

* Perhaps the Hammonds in *The Village Labourer* have depicted as well as any the sad results of the second great Enclosure wave, the pitiless isolation of the worker regarded as vermin by the squire, the lawyer, and the vicar, and his ineffectual protests against his degradation.

sumer and protect him from the demands of the organised producer anticipate needlessly imaginary difficulties. They retain a ghost on the chance of meeting others and thereby laying them. The class-consciousness necessary to achieve the taking over and the smooth running of the industrial machine will then replace all the sanctions, criterions, and threats of past moralities.

In the final conquest of political power, wishing to gain the help of the workers against its senior partner in the firm (the landed interest) and thereby generating the germs of its own decay, the capitalist class admitted, with certain restrictions, the workers to political rights. And these political rights, enlarged and backed by industrial might, may yet be a factor hastening the coming of the future industrial system of society.

BOOKS:

Besides Chapters already mentioned:—

Gibbins, Period V., Chap. I.

Morris and Bax's *Socialism: Its Growth and Outcome* (Kerr, 2s. 6d.), Chap. VIII.

Macaulay, Green and other historians should be read with the critical faculty alert. For the subjects discussed in the final paragraphs of this Outline, read W. W. Craik's closing pages.

Marx's *Communist Manifesto* and *18th Brumaire* for nature of the State.

Further information well summarised in Paul's *The State*, Chaps. VII. and VIII.

XIV.—THE BEGINNINGS OF TRADE UNIONS

AS far back as Outline V. an attempt was made to describe the modern wage-worker and his organisations in comparison with other preceding types of workers. History bears record to countless revolts of slave and serf, generally caused by the extortion or oppression of some tyrant. But these united efforts were short-lived, and contrary to these spasmodic, temporary combinations, the form of combination—whose beginning is the subject of this Outline—is continuous and lasting, and day by day, as the intelligence of its members increases, it becomes ever more powerful and important, solving present problems, and providing a fabric for future society.

Our survey will cover roughly the period from 1700—before which no continuous association of wage-earners can be said to have existed—to 1825, when the right of combination was secured and the formation of a Trade Union no longer considered to be a crime. Thus, as the Industrial Revolution is our next lesson, some overlapping will again occur; however, this method of treatment will have the advantage of clearly showing that Trade Unions did not, as is generally thought, arise only from the upheavals and distress of the Industrial Revolution, but that they were in being at least half a century before that event.

THE GUILD AND THE JOURNEYMAN'S ASSOCIATION.—A glance at the Guilds will destroy all the parallels sometimes drawn between them and Trade Unions. The Guild owned the simple and inexpensive tools of production; therefore, it also owned the finished product. The skilled and long-apprenticed worker's disappearance we have already followed. In the best days of the Guild the master was only an official of the Guild, and even at a later date the possibility of becoming a master stood before each journeyman. The Guild was different from the Trade Union both in structure

and function, and in making a comparison the likenesses are outnumbered by the differences.

The journeyman's associations, though undoubtedly containing the germ of the modern unions, were only ephemeral. Complaints against the journeymen cordwainers were heard as early as 1387; against the saddlers' serving-men in 1396; in 1497 the journeymen tailors were forbidden to assemble; and in 1530 we hear of friction between the shoemakers and their employers at Wisbech. "The working tailor," who made up the cloth brought to him by his customers in his own individual workshop, accused "the shopkeeping tailor" in 1681 of causing his detriment by hiring a smart shop and keeping a number of journeymen working for him, anticipating instead of obeying customers' orders. The capitalist and the permanent wage-worker are here seen evolving.

Further economic developments had, however, to take place before the antagonism between master and man became such a permanent force that the workers, striving to retain their status and standard of living, were welded into "continuous associations of wage-earners banded together for the purpose of maintaining or improving the conditions of their employment." The dissolving effects of commerce upon the old methods of production, the domestic system of production, the rape of newly-discovered worlds and the ensuing accumulation of wealth, and the growth of the manufactory system need not again be detailed. What we wish to discover is how the latter system deepened the antagonism between the owners and buyers of labour-power until this antagonism found its expression in the beginning of Trade Unions.

EFFECTS OF MANUFACTURE.—Manufacture arises in two ways:—

(1) *By the assembling of various independent and dissimilar handicraftsmen into one factory.*—For example, instead of the middleman or "clothier" in the cloth trade acting as a go-between for the various handicraftsmen, he assembled all these spinners, weavers,

fullers, dyers, etc., in his factory under his supervision.*

(2) *By the gathering of similar handicraftsmen in the factory.*—For a time the handicraftsmen may perform the same composite labour they performed outside the workshop; but soon the qualitative change follows the quantitative one, and the particular handicraft is split up into a series of detail operations, each becoming the work of a particular workman.

Yet, in whichever of the ways manufacture takes its rise, the result is the same; production is carried on by a social machine, the parts of which are human beings. Bearing this conclusion in mind, and never forgetting that the motive of capitalist production is to produce surplus value, and that profits can only be increased at the expense of relative wages, we will now endeavour to trace how manufacture affected labour and the labourer.

From what has been already said, it will be understood that labour was now changed from *composite* into *detail* labour; and the labourer, using his detail tool, is now, not a "synthetic" worker, but a fractional one. By this specialisation, by the saving of time

* Another oft-used example taken from Marx is the manufacture of carriages. Here again a number of independent craftsmen, wheelwrights, harness makers, locksmiths, carpenters, painters, etc., are brought together and combine their efforts in the production of one commodity. "The tailor, the locksmith, and the other artificers, being now exclusively occupied in carriage-making, each gradually loses, through want of practice, the ability to carry on, to its full extent, his old handicraft. But, on the other hand, his activity, now confined in one groove, assumes the form best adapted to the narrowed sphere of action. At first, carriage manufacture is a combination of various independent handicrafts. By degrees, it becomes the splitting up of carriage-making into its various detail processes, each of which crystallises into the exclusive function of a particular workman, the manufacture, as a whole, being carried on by the men in conjunction." In the same way, a colliery blacksmith, or a colliery engineman, is differentiated in course of time from blacksmiths and enginemen who do not help to produce the commodity coal.

formerly occupied in changing jobs and tools, and by the workers' acquirement of a special aptitude and facility obtained by continuous practice in particular operations, the productivity of labour was enormously increased, and the simplification of operations made the way clear for the introduction of the machine tool, operated at first by human power, but later driven by other superior forces. The worker had to be reduced to a machine before he could be displaced by a machine. It is hardly necessary to state who reaped the benefits from the increased productivity of labour. Wages relatively decreased, and often nominally also.

Now in the assembling of handicraftsmen long apprenticeship and skill would still, to some extent, be necessary; but in the second way of manufacture's rise, when handicrafts were split up, the need for skill and the time for learning and probation would be greatly diminished. In fact, some of the operations in the series needed no skill at all. So, instead of the handicraftsmen having all passed through the same qualifying period, being equally skilled and receiving equal rates, there is now a difference between the skilled and the unskilled worker; a hierarchy of labour powers, with different grades receiving different wages. The skilled labour-power, in which is embodied years of training, is obviously more costly than unskilled labour-power. The destruction of skill, which occurred in the assembling and division of handicrafts (though only partially in the former) cheapened labour-power and increased surplus value. What is saved by not having to pay the wages of skill goes to swell the profits of the individual capitalist. This explains, for example, why a colliery company is always eager to introduce, wherever possible, coal-cutters and boring machinery in order to escape paying the cost of skilled hewers and borers.

Another way in which manufacture lessened the independence of the labourer and increased surplus value was that, by this new method of production, the labour-powers bought in the labour market individu-

ally from their respective owners are consumed collectively by the capitalist buyer in his factory. For, just as two men lifting together can shift a stone which they could not lift apart, or as a wire rope is much stronger than the total individual strengths of the wires which compose it, so individual labour-powers, when organised in one factory and used in co-operation with each other, produce more than if they were consumed apart.* The credit and profit of this increased productiveness, begotten by the power of associated labour, goes however to the capitalist, who at the time of which we are writing had not relinquished the exercise of "directive ability" to an official managerial class and become a parasite, as at present.

One factor which caused the manufacturer to increase the rate of the exploitation of labour (consequently generating deeper antagonism) was the fact that the concentration of capital now began. The manufactories tended to become larger and larger as the benefits derived from them became more evident. Clearly one manufactory, in which 80 people could work, would be cheaper to build than two, in each of which only 40 people could work. And if 40 people created a certain amount of surplus value, the larger number would create more than double that amount. Larger capitals are really created by unpaid labour; the need for larger starting capitals would be an incitement to the manufacturers, competing among themselves, to enlarge the amount of surplus labour or surplus value because this is the only source of additional capital.

* Just as the offensive power of a squadron of cavalry, or the defensive power of a regiment of infantry is essentially different from the sum of the offensive or defensive powers of the individual cavalry or infantry soldiers taken separately, so the sum total of the mechanical forces exerted by isolated workmen differs from the social force that is developed, when many hands take part simultaneously in one and the same undivided operation, such as raising a heavy weight, turning a winch or removing an obstacle." Chapter XIII. of *Capital* gives many other illustrations of the emulation, stimulation, and benefits arising from social labour.

But all these improvements which were so beneficial to the manufacturer were accomplished at the expense of the labourer. Lost is the old creative joy of taking the product through all its various stages. The labourer has now to confine his attention to the performance of a particular, monotonous, detail operation. His former independence is lost, too, for, being only skilled in one partial operation, he cannot work outside the factory gates away from the machine of which he is a cog; he becomes a mere appendage of the machine of social production. "Head and hand part company." Thinking is performed by an official class, and the labourer does the working. Honest spokesmen of the capitalist class have on many occasions pointed out the folly of educating the workers and their children because of its uselessness to them in their after life. Many farmers and other employers and even many workers—sad though it be to say it—would be in favour, even in our own days, of lowering the school-leaving age on the same grounds.*

After noticing these effects of manufacture, the specialisation of the labourer and his tools, the reduction and destruction of skilled labour, the increased profits made by social labour, and the coming of permanent wage-labourers with an ever-diminishing chance of becoming capitalists themselves, it is only to be expected that the workers should be forced by a compelling necessity to join together to preserve their standard of living.

STRUCTURE AND POLICY OF THE EARLY UNIONS.—Though, as pointed out above, manufacture reduced the amount of skilled labour necessary, yet it did not entirely destroy handicraft, which was still the basis of production. Therefore, the first unions were composed of skilled handicraftsmen, and possessed a craft basis or structure. This craft structure enabled

* Such workers have accepted and reconciled themselves to that commodity status which is theirs under Capitalism, which ignores their rights and needs as human beings.

the unions to perform their functions until it was made obsolete by the coming of machinery. They were also local in their form and at first were only local trade clubs. While certain trades and industries were still restricted to particular districts, and communication and travelling were almost undeveloped, the form could not be otherwise. Only in later times do we see the evolution of the local unions into national and international ones.

The workers tried hard to retain their skill and long apprenticeships against the encroachments of new developments. Enshrined in the traditions of the workers was the memory of the 14th and 15th century Golden Age of labour. This gave them an historic background for ideas of independence and for a belief in the sufficiency of a four-day week of labour. Loud were the complaints of the manufacturers and their intellectual lackeys at this spirit. The divine example of resting only upon the seventh day was cited in vain to these "intractable, self-willed workmen." "Throughout the whole manufacturing period there runs the complaint of want of discipline among the workmen." . . . "Order must in one way or another be established," wrote one anonymous author; and the famous Dr. Ure rejoiced when "Arkwright created order." Legislation directed to keep down wages was ineffective during the first two centuries of its existence, as the labourers were in a powerful economic position; and right up to the Industrial Revolution, the export trade was gradually getting bigger, and the workers being in demand and still owning in some cases a part of their tools, could still command attention and insist upon the observance of the seven years' apprenticeship. Not till 1777 was a Bill destroying this apprentice limit successfully carried through Parliament at the instigation of the master-hatters.

Thus in their policy, the early unions endeavoured to keep the supply of labour below the demand, for their own benefit. The State still claiming to regulate wages, the unions could not openly, legally, demand in-

creased rates of pay; therefore they were forced to cloak over their real trade purposes with the friendly benefit side of their work. They paid out-of-work, sick, and funeral pay, and had meetings presumably for social purposes. But, as Adam Smith wrote: "The people of the same trade seldom meet together for merriment and diversion but the conversation ends in a conspiracy against the public [!] in some contrivance to raise wages."

1700-1799.—The following are examples of authentic Trade Unions which sprang up in this period (for further examples the reader should consult Webb):—

In 1720 the master-tailors complained to Parliament of their employees, who had demanded higher wages and shorter hours, and had "registered their names in a book and contributed funds for their common defence." Parliament fixed a *maximum* wage for them, and in 1767 further injunctions were issued against their efforts.

In the woollen manufacture in the West of England, from 1717 to 1725, the masters complained to Parliament of the combinations of their workmen. In the same industry in Yorkshire the factory system was later in its development, and therefore, conditions not being ripe before, we only find combinations there in 1794.

The Woolcombers in the worsted industry, in 1741, combined sick benefits and trade regulation. The Woolstaplers and the Carriers possessed federal unions in 1795 which aided their members when on tramp in search of work. The Spitalfields Silkweavers and the Goldbeaters combined in 1773 and 1777 respectively. The Knitters combined when, though still working in their cottages, their frames were hired from the small capitalist frame-owner who also gave out and collected the work. In 1780 when this frame renting became general their union was formed.

In their development these combinations petitioned Parliament to enforce its own laws in regard to wages

and apprentice restrictions. The conditions then made the manufacturing class revolutionary and the workers conservative; but, as always, the progressive forces won. "That which does not move forward ultimately decays." The weavers of Stroud in 1719, and the weavers of Wilts and Somerset in 1726, appealed to the King for aid against their masters. In 1756 the Gloucester operatives had a table of wages fixed for them by Parliament. This Act, however, was repealed soon after, and later petitions were useless. The destruction of the apprentice regulations has been before noted.

With the coming of the Industrial Revolution, Trade Unions multiplied, in a pathetic attempt to prohibit machinery and retain the old standards. By 1792 and 1796 we find the Oldham and Stockport cotton operatives forming professedly benefit clubs. Parliament was torn between the old policy of State regulation of hours and wages and the new policy of *laissez-faire*. The unions, having all their complaints disregarded, tried to win their claims by strikes, and these provoked fierce denunciations of "conspiracies to raise wages" from the employers. These strikes and the machine-smashing riots were thought by the timid aristocracy to be attempts to imitate the violence of the French Revolutionists. At length, plagued by petitions and alarmed by the ever-growing Trade Union activity, Parliament hurried through the Combination Acts of 1799 and 1800. These Acts made general and confirmed the former Acts made against individual unions; they made all combinations of any kind illegal and contained severe punishments against offenders. The Trade Unions had now to become secret societies or perish.

1800-1825.—Now begins "the struggle for existence." The unions continued their work in secrecy, and in particular districts some trades were powerful enough to force the employers to treat with them; in others they were destroyed by legal prosecution. Sporadic strikes, rick burnings and riots were severely punished by hanging and transportation. The workers

in the machine-invaded industries were the worst off. The conditions of secrecy and the savage sentences passed upon offenders—for the 1799 Act was ferociously administered—made for sporadic unions, and prevented any permanent or national organisations. Strikes occurred—*e.g.*, the Durham and Northumberland miners struck in 1810 against their yearly bond and the truck system; Dowlais saw the sacking of Crawshay's truck shops and strikes against reductions in 1810 and 1817; and the weavers, in a strike extending from Carlisle to Aberdeen, struck against deductions and other grievances in 1812. Survivals of the oaths and awe-inspiring ceremonies used in these two associations may still be traced.

Following the Napoleonic Wars came a terrible time of stagnation and distress, aggravated by the Corn Laws. Machine breaking by the Luddites, the hanging and transportation of rioters, the march of the Blanketeers, the further application of machinery to other industries and the resulting dislocation, the prohibition of public meetings and of newspapers by heavy stamp duties—these were some of the events of the most unhappy second decade of the 19th century. The significance of Peterloo will be remembered when Waterloo is forgotten. Aided by the Radicals, the workers made attempts to repeal the Combination Act. Francis Place and Joseph Hume were prominent in this work, and success crowned the effort in 1824. Contrary to the expectations of some of its promoters, after the repeal Trade Unions arose all over the country. The boom in Trade Unions and strikes which followed the long legal suppression alarmed the ruling classes, who had let the Repeal Bill slip through almost unnoticed. They secured the passing of an Act in 1825 which reaffirmed the former laws against conspiracy and gave only a limited recognition to the Trade Unions. The Trade Unions had now the right to combine to secure increased wages or withhold their labour to avoid a decrease. But the Act contained terms about "molestation," "obstruction," and "intimidation" which

were capable of a very wide meaning in the hands of hostile lawyers and judges, and almost made a strike impracticable. Many of the new unions were broken up by the depression of the crisis which came in the following years, and when we take up their history it will be to follow the revolutionary hopes of 1829 and onwards.

Organised Labour is the Frankenstein of Capitalism. If it were possible, Capitalism would satisfy its appetite for surplus value without bringing into being these inevitable, unwelcome companions. Working together, exploited together, organised together in their unions, the workers, looking no longer to the past, but to the future, are together digging the grave of Capitalism.

BOOKS:

Craik, Section III.

Capital, Vol. I., Chaps. XIII. and XIV., on Co-operation, and a masterly analysis of the effects of The Division of Labour and Manufacture.

Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations*, and

Beard's *Industrial Revolution*, also contain interesting references.

Webb's *History of Trade Unionism* (Longmans, a new edition forthcoming), Chaps. I. and II.

St. J. G. Ervine's *Francis Place* (a Fabian Tract, 3d.).

XV.—THE INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION

OUR last two Outlines have overlapped this remarkable event, or series of events, which is the great landmark in industrial history. The Industrial Revolution took place between the years 1760 and 1830, and, like other revolutions, it was the product of centuries of evolution. It neither abruptly started nor finished at the dates given; for previous inventions had been made, and the perfecting of the inventions therein made has never stopped. It was in these momentous years, however, that machinery and science were applied to industry in an unprecedented fashion.

Thus, again remembering the relativity of all beginnings, we can follow the development of manufacture into machinofacture—a process so important and powerful in its effects that it is rightly termed a revolution. The speeding-up of the labour processes, and the dilution of labour then made possible, is only faintly paralleled in our own day by the wonderful increase in the productivity of labour, secured by organised efforts made under the stress of war.

It should be clearly understood that the introduction of machinery into industry could only come after manufacture had instituted the division of labour inside the workshop, and split up the old handicrafts into simple detail operations. "*The Revolution of the 18th century began with the tool only because the preceding revolution began with the labourer.*" Only when the labourer performed a simple mechanical task could he be displaced by a machine. A machine could not take a piece of leather and make it into a boot; but when the process was divided up into cutting-out, stitching and other separate tasks, then machines were competent to perform the separated, simplified operations. Unlike the first simple original machines or automatic tools, modern machines tend to become more complex, to combine several machines in one, and often perform

all the operations necessary to complete the product. Take, for example, the production of a modern daily paper.

Again, machinofacture would never have commenced if there had not been the need of supplying a world market. This was the great factor which made the old methods of production inadequate.

THE TOOL AND THE MACHINE.—Man's tools are as old as himself; he is "the tool-making animal." Long before the science of mechanics had been thought of, unnamed inventors had discovered the use of the wheel, the lever, the pulley, the screw, the inclined plane, and the wedge, these simple mechanical powers of which the most complex machine is composed. It was a long time, however, before the tool—defined as "an instrument used by workmen"—was combined with these mechanical powers to form the machine as we now know it.

Viewed apart from their historic evolution, the difference between the tool and the machine is hard to define. For example, the plough drawn by oxen, according to the definition already given, would be a machine; while a complicated machine, if operated by human labour, would be a tool. As Marx puts it, a fully-developed machine has three essentially different parts, the motor mechanism, where the driving power is generated, the transmitting mechanism, such as gearing, ropes, belts, fly-wheels, etc., and the tool or working part of the machine. The machine begins when the tool is taken out of the hands of the workman "and fitted into a mechanism." But here comes the great improvement. "The number of implements that man himself can use simultaneously is limited by the number of his own natural instruments of production, by the number of his bodily organs." (Try to imagine a collier using two mandrils or sledges at once and you will see the point.) With the coming of the machine, however, these "organic limits" are destroyed. "The spinning jenny, even at its very birth, spun with 12 to 18 spindles, and the stocking-loom knits with

many thousand needles at once." The man-drill has only one point in operation at a time; but the swiftly-revolving disc or bar of a coal-cutter is armed with many points in simultaneous operation. When many ploughshares are combined for use we talk about ploughing by machinery.

THE FIRST STAGE OF THE MACHINE.—Here man is still the generator and transmitter of the necessary motive power; only the function of handling the tool has been taken from him. This spells the further destruction of handicraft. The domestic producers had in their cottages simple machines. Later, when the machines grew bigger, man's powers of strength and endurance were not sufficient, and animal-power was tried. We read of Cartwright's first power-loom being worked by a bull. But animal-power, too, had its limits and was expensive. The horse, even in transport and agriculture, is slowly making way for petrol-driven vehicles and other machines.

THE SECOND STAGE OF THE MACHINE.—In this stage the power of wind and water is utilised, the latter being especially used by the new machines. Wind-power has never been used on a large scale in England. "In 1836, 12,000 windmills of 6,000 horse-power were still employed in Holland, to prevent two-thirds of the land being reconverted into morasses." Wind is too inconstant and variable to be a successful motive power for machinery. Water-power also has its drawbacks; it, too, is variable and uncertain. Available heads of water—Niagaras being scarce—are hard to find, and the factories are restricted to the local water-sides. "In the 17th century attempts had already been made to turn two pairs of millstones with a single water-wheel. But the increased size of the gearing was too much for the water-power, which had now become insufficient, and this was one of the circumstances that led to a more accurate investigation of the laws of friction." Arkwright's mill was water-driven. ;§

THE THIRD STAGE.—The ever-increasing size of the machines made imperative the finding of a reliable,

sure, controllable power. The power was found in steam, a never-tiring, almighty giant, stopping only when its human attendants have exhausted themselves. The discovery came about gradually. In James Watt's patent of 1769 culminated the efforts of a large number of scientists and inventors reaching back to a very crude pumping engine in 120 B.C. A century previous to Watt, Savery and Worcester, and in 1705 Newcomen also, had invented steam-engines for pumping purposes. Besides having the much-mentioned benefit of noticing the lid of the boiling kettle, Watt had the advantage of being instrument maker to Glasgow University, of acquaintance with Dr. Black, the discoverer of latent heat, who, with Dr. Roebuck, helped Watt financially, and of having the opportunity of reading the books and examining and repairing the models of men like Papin, Savery and Worcester. Like other inventions, his was not an individual but a social product. He greatly improved the steam-engine by introducing a separate condenser and making it double-acting. Later he joined with Boulton, and as purveyors of the means of power urgently needed by the new machinery, the firm of Boulton & Watt thrived.

MACHINERY AND TEXTILES.—The mode of production in the textile industry—that industry, as usual, being in the forefront of development—was revolutionised in the 18th century by a succession of inventions of which the following are examples (different authorities give different dates; Gibbins' are here followed):—Kay's flying shuttle (1730) greatly quickened the process of weaving. "Hitherto the weaver had passed the shuttle carrying the weft through the threads of the warp from hand to hand. . . . Kay's invention, by which the shuttle was mechanically propelled from side to side, not only enabled the weaver to work wide cloth as easily as narrow, but it more than doubled the pace at which the work could be done." It now became impossible for the spinners to supply the weavers with enough yarn. Machinery

applied in one branch of the industry must needs be applied to other branches in order for them to keep step. (The coal-cutter and the conveyor are close associates.) In 1770 Hargreaves invented "the spinning jenny," which, displacing the old single thread spinning-wheel, spun 16 to 18 threads at once, and supplied the weavers with the yarn they needed. Arkwright's "water frame" (1771) for carding, roving, and spinning, "first made possible the manufacture of true cotton goods in England."

Crompton (1779) combined the advantages of the last two inventions in his "mule." By 1811 we hear of $4\frac{1}{2}$ million spindles being worked; and in modern production, in striking contrast to the old methods, thousands of spindles are often simultaneously worked by one spinner. Crompton died, as many inventors have died, in poverty, and he and his fellow-inventors were often the victims of the violence of the workers, who feared that these new machines would destroy their livelihood.

The power-loom of Cartwright (1785) brought weaving up to spinning again. After many improvements it provided the chance of the first application of steam-power in textiles. In 1813, 2,400 of these power-looms were in operation. Twenty years later that number had increased to 100,000.

Until Eli Whitney invented his gin for cleaning cotton by machinery, the cotton trade suffered from a lack of raw material. Before this machine came, five or six pounds of cotton per man were cleaned in one day; but after its coming one man could clean 1,000 lbs. per day, and the shortage of raw material disappeared.

These inventions in the cotton industry were afterwards applied to the woollen and linen trades, to hosiery, silk and lace making. Hundreds of minor improvements were brought about in printing, bleaching, and dyeing the fabrics produced. One example must suffice: Bell's printing cylinder (1783), used to print calico goods, with the aid of one man and

a boy, performed the work formerly done by 200 block-printers.

Moreover, progress was not confined to the textile industry; in the china and earthenware trades similar advances were made. Wedgwood, about 1763, began to produce the pottery which made his name famous. Inventions in one trade provoked inventions in others.

COAL MINING.—It was the difficulties and necessities of the early miners which led to the first steam-driven pumping engines. Improved steam-engines and machinery were soon used in sinking shafts and raising coal. The machine brought within reach its own fuel. The industrial centres shifted from the South and West of England to the North; from the riversides to the coalfields. Gibbins' map (facing page 164) forcibly demonstrates how intimately linked together are the industrial towns and their large populations with the coal-mining centres. The output of coal rapidly increased. Ten millions of tons in 1800 had increased to 49 in 1850 and to 272 in 1907, and keeping to about that level ever since.

IRON MINING AND SMELTING.—The machine, coal, and iron are inseparable, and they cannot be considered apart from each other. The superiority of iron machines over wooden ones did not take much finding out. Yet England for a long time could not use, on a large scale, her own supplies of ore because of the great amount of timber consumed in its smelting. The use of coke and, afterwards, by improved furnaces, of raw coal for smelting destroyed this barrier.

The end of the century saw the growth of gigantic iron-works all over the country. In 1784 Colebrookdale had 16 steam-engines, eight blast-furnaces, and nine forges. In 1765 Anthony Bacon had got a 99 years' lease of mineral rights over 40 square miles of country round Merthyr Tydfil for £200 a year, but in less than 20 years he retired with a fortune, and from the sale of his rights began the great works at Cyfarthfa, Dowlais and Pen-y-darren. Crawshay, of Cyfarthfa, who in 1787 had made 40 tons of malleable iron in a month was, by 1812, turning out 20 times as much.

In 1856 the Bessemer process of making steel was originated. With iron machinery in all the important industries, with iron engines running on iron rails over iron bridges, with houses built on iron girders, with iron vessels and armour-plated Dreadnoughts, and with the universal use of iron, in war as well as peace, in things both small and great, ours can be truly called the age of iron and steel.

MACHINE-MADE MACHINERY.—But the smelting difficulty was not the only one to be overcome. When Watt was labouring with his early engine, "Beelzebub," he thought himself "fortunate if the cylinder bored by the Carron workmen were not more than three-eighths of an inch out of truth." Besides this lack of accuracy, there was the inability of manufacture to produce "the cyclopean machines" needed, owing to their size. The limits of manufacture blocked the way until machinery was produced by machinery. In his brilliant chapter on Machinery and Modern Industry, Marx writes:—

The most essential condition to the production of machines by machines was a prime mover capable of exerting any amount of force, and yet under perfect control. Such a condition was already supplied by the steam-engine. But at the same time it was necessary to produce the geometrically straight lines, planes, circles, cones, and spheres required in the detail parts of the machine. This problem Henry Maudsley solved in the first decade of this century by the invention of the slide-rest, a tool that was soon made automatic, and in a modified form was applied to other constructive machines besides the lathe, for which it was originally intended. This mechanical appliance replaces, not some particular tool, but the hand itself, which produces a given form by holding and guiding the cutting tool along the iron or other material operated upon. Thus it became possible to produce the forms of the individual parts of machinery, "with a degree of speed, accuracy and ease that no accumulated experience of the most skilled workman could give."

Much better should we be able to appreciate the immense effects of the Industrial Revolution, if we could make an extended tour throughout England's

modern workshops, see the gigantic steam-hammers and hydraulic presses at work; follow the iron ore through its processes until it is forged, welded, bored and planed as if it were clay, into the required shapes; watch the cranes swinging easily about their heavy burdens; visit the dockyards where the mammoth floating palaces and the huge ships of war have their birth; enter the factories where the production of textile commodities proceeds ceaselessly, or the engineering shops where forests of quickly-moving belts connect the individual machines to the central driving automaton. After such a tour the Industrial Revolution would assume added significance—"Man is the master of things."

TRANSPORT.—A revolution in the ways of transport now became necessary to meet the new methods of production. The mules who, in 1801, carried coal and iron ore from Dowlais to Cardiff, could not for long have been found satisfactory. How could industry proceed without efficient transport facilities on sea and land? The roads, formerly with ruts in winter 4 feet deep, in which waggons were often stranded, and having only a narrow causeway for the use of the pack-horses, were improved, and new roads engineered by Metcalf, Telford, Macadam and others. These improvements made the comparatively swift stage-coach possible.

In addition canals were made. Gibbins furnishes information of the boom in canal-making which reached its height in 1791-4. Space forbids us to follow the story of the application of the steam-engine to transport. However, from the canals of 1761, from Trevithick's railroad-engine of 1803 (which is not without strong Welsh local associations), from the steam-driven vessels on the Clyde in 1812, and from Stephenson's "Rocket" of 1814, and its application to passenger traffic in 1825, right on down to our own day, we see these very necessary transport facilities developing; they now connect market with factory, town with country, and link the whole world together.

The first Atlantic steam-crossing in 1837, the beginning of the penny post in 1840, the first telegraph wires of 1844, the railway speculation mania of 1845—which would have turned the country into a gridiron and made transport impossible if all its projected railways had been laid down—and the laying of the first submarine cable from Dover to Calais in 1850—these are only a few of the many developments which followed.

ENGLAND'S START.—Reference has already been made to the need of the world market for supplies as the chief cause of the Industrial Revolution. Having won commercial supremacy and owning the markets, England was able to achieve industrial supremacy over her rivals. Thanks to her insular position, which kept her unravaged by European wars, her natural stores of coal and iron, and her early application of the new powers and machinery, England became "the workshop of the world." Her exports rose from £17,000,000 in 1793 to £58,000,000 in 1815. She was "the world's factory, the world's carrier, and the world's money-market" for many years. Such a splendid start did she have that only within recent years have her competitors caught her up.

AGRICULTURAL EFFECTS.—After a while farming benefited, too, from the Industrial Revolution, and adopted new methods. The destruction of the class of domestic producers encouraged large-scale farming. The large proprietors completed the decay of "the open field system" and the peasant smallholder. New roots and grasses, rotation of crops, and better breeds of cattle were introduced. The great increase of population and the increasing difference between town and country enlarged the demand for agricultural produce. Agricultural machinery helped to displace the agricultural labourer, whose last revolt of 1830 with its machine-breaking incidents was quelled so mercilessly by the judicial atrocities of a thoroughly-alarmed class. From 1750 onwards, there begins that depopulation of the country and that crowding into

the towns which has left so many problems as unenviable legacies of the past to the present. Three-quarters of England's inhabitants are now town-dwellers.

This brings our Outline to a close. The student should read carefully the chapters listed. To examine the birth of the machine is the first step to understand its logic. "Our knowledge of Nature is still in its infancy." Invention has only just begun. Next we shall see how machinery, "which is in itself a victory of man over the forces of nature," extended and intensified labour, brought new and untold horrors in its train, and made a large section of mankind less free than they had ever been before. But these are the effects of the Industrial Revolution only so long as its fruits are privately owned. Our efforts should be directed to rise to possession and control, so that machinery shall no longer work against us, but for us. The social forces, as well as the natural forces, must be consciously conquered.

BOOKS:

Gibbins, Period V.

Warner, Chaps. XV. and XVI.

Capital. Vol. I., Chap. XV.

Craik, Section II.

Beard's *Industrial Revolution*.

Hammonds' *Town Labourer* (Longmans, 10s.), and

Village Labourer (10s.) contain well-arranged information for this and the next Outline dealing specifically with the 1760-1830 period.

XVI.—THE INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION
AND THE WORKERS

AT the conclusion of the last Outline, and also in dealing with the early phases of the Trade Unions in Outline XIV., the gloomy and disastrous results of the Industrial Revolution upon the status and conditions of the workers were foreshadowed. They will now be followed more closely. But no pen will ever do justice to this period of "dreadful night," or ever succeed in fully describing the pitiful state to which so many of the workers were then degraded. The Industrial Revolution enabled the middle class to achieve final supremacy over the old nobility, who now became its adjuncts. It enabled the capitalist to ignore all limits of sex or age, day or night, and to satisfy his ravenous appetite for surplus labour and profits in a mad orgy; until the glutton had—for his own sake as well as his victims,—to put a knife to his throat and restrain his greed for the good of his digestion, and in order to secure his continued existence. The ravages and the forced checking of the stretching of this natural appetite form our present subject.

THE COMPETITION OF THE MACHINE.—The fate of the early workers, competing with the machine when it began to invade their industry, was especially unhappy. The machine-produced commodity contains less labour than the hand-produced commodity; as it is the amount of socially necessary labour which determines the value of the product, the human competitor who still follows the older process has to sell at the same price as the machine: and his wages are lowered and hours extended in the hopeless struggle. The same process occurs when old machinery is competing with new, or a small factory with a big one; the workers' wages are lowered to help make up for the handicap of the old machinery and obsolete methods.

Writing in 1844, Engels graphically depicted the poverty endured by the handloom weavers before they were finally ousted by the power-loom.

INTRODUCTION OF WOMAN AND CHILD LABOUR.—“The constant aim and the tendency of every improvement in machinery,” wrote Dr. Ure, the philosopher of machinofacture, “is in fact, to do away entirely with the labour of man, or to lessen its price by substituting the labour of women and children for that of grown-up men, or of unskilled for that of skilled workmen.” Ample contemporary evidence is given in Gibbins, Chapter IV., to prove this statement. “Persons of all ages and both sexes collected together in huge buildings, under no moral control, with no arrangement for the preservation of health, comfort or decency.” The terrible lot of the child slaves of the factory-system sickens the imagination. As early as 1802, legislation was necessary, “for the preservation of the health and morals of apprentices and others employed in cotton and other mills,” because of the ravages of a terrible disease in the factory districts, the natural result of insanitary workshops and homes, inferior and scanty food, and constant overwork. Extracts from the speeches of Shaftesbury and other reformers, and even from the official reports of factory inspectors, teem with details of these early horrors of the factory system which are almost unbelievable; and they also contain figures giving indubitable proof of the displacement of adult labour.

By the employment of women and children the home was broken up. The following may be found in the sad pages of Engels' *Conditions*:—

The employment of women at once breaks up the family; for when the wife spends 12 or 13 hours every day in the mill, and the husband works the same length of time, there or elsewhere, what becomes of the children? They grow up like wild weeds; they are put out to nurse for a shilling or eighteen pence a week, and how they are treated may be imagined. . . . In many cases the family is not wholly dissolved by the labour of the wife, but turned upside down. The wife supports

the family, the husband sits at home, tends the children, sweeps the room and cooks.

Then he (Engels) gives a pathetic letter from a working man relating such an instance. Thus while there took place an enormous increase in infantile mortality, while immorality, child slavery, ignorance, and want flourished, capital, by machinery's aid, raised the degree of exploitation.

The value of labour-power was determined, not by the labour-time necessary to maintain the adult labourer, but also by that necessary to maintain his family. Machinery by throwing every member of that family upon the labour market, spreads the value of the man's labour-power over the whole family. It thus depreciates his labour-power. To purchase the labour-power of a family of four workers may perhaps cost more than it formerly did to purchase the labour-power of the head of the family, but, in return, four days' labour takes the place of one, and their price falls in proportion to the excess of the surplus-labour of one. In order that the family may live, four people must now not only labour but expend surplus-labour for the capitalist.

EXTENSION AND INTENSIFICATION OF LABOUR.—When Capitalism "was in the summer-time of this its first love," we read of ceaseless day and night work, of children working by relays and sleeping "in filthy beds which were never allowed to cool," and of weary hands and feet having to rapidly follow the quick movements of the never-tiring machines. Not till 1832 and 1847 was the factory working day reduced to 12 and 10 hours respectively; and when hours were limited, then by increased intensity, within the shortened day, production was maintained at the same level.

The factors making the capitalist anxious for a quick turn-over can be easily understood. Besides the stimulus of a wide, ready world market, and the huge profits made by the first adopters of the new machines over their slower rival capitalists, the early capitalist wished to get back as quickly as possible the constant capital embodied in the new machines, because

they were not then so well protected against the natural elements as now, and they stood in danger of being superseded by new superior inventions. Therefore, as these dangers of dead losses existed, the capitalist, by extending the working day to the 24 hours, attempted to get back his capital as soon as he could. The faster the value of the machinery was transferred to the commodity by the labourer, the more the risks of non-use and supersession were obviated. Thus the machine made man its slave.

CRISES AND DISTRESS.—Another result of the Industrial Revolution was the terrible decennial crises and times of depression which now regularly occurred. Famines and scarcity through natural causes, earthquakes, drought, hurricanes, etc., had always been known to mankind; but these new periods of disaster, dogging the most prosperous and busy periods, had never been known before. Many explanations have been put forward which, upon examination, are not satisfactory, or only record the symptoms and not the true cause and cure of this disease. The fact is that Capitalism practises law and order inside the workshop, but outside it practises anarchy. In times of prosperity, their owners being eager for profits, the wheels of production are speeded up. Everything proceeds madly. Rival capitalists, in fierce competition, make no attempt to estimate the needs of the market, and glut it with their commodities, until soon the prices fall and the inevitable crash comes, and lasts until the stocks have been consumed and confidence is again restored. At such times as these, when poverty is caused by plenty; when bootmakers' children have to go without boots because their parents have produced too many boots, and when it would be a good thing for the workers if the products produced by their toil and effort were to vanish into smoke, so that they might once again have the opportunity of earning wages, then the contradictions in the capitalist system are most apparent; then social production and individual distribution stand in vivid con-

trast with each other, and Capitalism is clearly seen to be a fetter upon production. For as long as the surplus labour, or the unpaid part of the product, is owned, not by the worker, but by the capitalist, then there must be a search for a market in which to dispose of this surplus product, and when the market fails, then must come the crisis. Previous to the Industrial Revolution, production had never been able to fully supply the needs of the market. Later in our lessons, we shall have occasion to refer to the various crises in the 19th century as they affected the workers, gradually changing from sharp and acute affairs to longer periods of permanent depression.* An attempt might well be made to show how the warlike phase of Capitalism, needing markets for its surplus iron and steel commodities, as well as supplies of raw material for the making of the same, has resulted in a terrible crisis and in the highest form of waste imaginable.

The high wheat prices, ranging often above 100s. per quarter, and spelling starvation to the workers, aggravated the distress of the workers in the early decades of the century. The peasant of 1830, according to the Hammonds, received less in wages without land than he had received when his wages were supplemented by the common rights. The capitalist, increasing his constant capital, and dispensing with some of his workers as he lessened his variable capital, was the upper millstone; while the landed interest, intent on securing good rents from the farmers by protecting them by the Corn Laws, was the nether millstone, which, between them, crushed into poverty and starvation the powerless workers.

The state of affairs which the Truck Act in later times made an attempt to remedy was in existence, and this, too, helped to fill the workers' bitter cup to the brim.

DESTRUCTION OF SKILL.—This was another effect of

* For a good account of these happenings, the student should consult Hyndman's *Commercial Crises of the 19th Century*.

the Industrial Revolution. Back in the neighbourhood of 1860, Nasmyth, the inventor of the steam-hammer, said:—

The characteristic feature of our modern mechanical improvements is the introduction of self-acting machinery. What every mechanical workman has now to do, and what every boy can do, is not to work himself, but to superintend the beautiful labour of the machine. The whole class of workmen that depend exclusively upon their skill is now done away with. Formerly, I employed four boys to every machine. Thanks to these new mechanical combinations, I have reduced the number of grown-up men from 1,500 to 759. The result was a considerable increase in my profits.

Bearing in mind who are the receivers of the benefits of the modern dilution of labour, the truth of the last sentence will not be doubted. The undermining of the craft basis and structure of the Trade Unions by industrial development hastened the Revolution—and, being still continued, is a subject big enough for separate treatment.

THE FACTORY ACTS.—We have now to turn to the limits which had to be placed upon the operations of a soulless Capitalism—limits strenuously opposed by the capitalists, who prophesied immediate disaster from these attempts to interfere with the rights of unrestrainedly exploiting men, women and children. "John Bright especially distinguished himself (February 10, 1847) by his violent denunciation of the Ten Hours' Bill, which he characterised as 'one of the worst measures ever passed in the shape of an Act of the legislature.'" (Gibbins furnishes the page, etc., in Hansard, where this "extraordinary utterance" can still be found.) However, these gloomy prognostications proved to be false. These limits prevented Capitalism from "killing the goose that laid the golden egg," and delayed its Nemesis.

Marx, in his chapter on The Working Day, tells us that:—

As soon as the working class, stunned at first by the noise and turmoil of the new system of production, recovered, in some

measure, its senses, its resistance began, and first in the native land of mechanism, in England. For 30 years, however, the concessions conquered by the workpeople were purely nominal. Parliament passed five Labour Laws between 1802 and 1833, but was shrewd enough not to vote a penny for their carrying out, for the requisite officials, etc.

To follow the various Factory Acts which were passed between 1833 and 1864; to notice how these Acts were passed in the face of fierce opposition, and then evaded in many ingenious ways, by the help of biassed interpretations from interested magistrates; to admire the work of men like Owen, Shaftesbury, Oastler, and Sadler in getting these Acts passed, the work of men like Factory Inspector Leonard Horner in getting them actually observed; and to notice how the landlords helped the workers with the Factory Acts in order to revenge themselves upon the industrial capitalists, but how they fought the Repeal of the Corn Laws when their own interests were involved—these are things to which the reader can profitably direct his attention by reading the chapters listed.

The Act of 1833 was the first to stop children under nine years of age from entering certain factories, and it limited the working week of a nine-year-old child to 48 hours and of a thirteen to eighteen-year-old child to 69 hours. The educational needs of the workers—previously entirely neglected—were recognised by the institution of "half-timers" in later Acts. The schools for many years hardly deserved their name. Many of the teachers could not even write their own names correctly. Fatigued by toil, the children fell asleep on the stools. Later, rival theologians, squabbling over the children's souls, hindered the education of their minds and bodies. At Queen Victoria's accession one quarter of the children were totally uneducated; 49 per cent. of the boys and 57 per cent. of the girls could not read; and 67 per cent. of the boys and 88 per cent. of the girls could not write. Sympathy for our fellows, with their often low outlook upon life, is engendered

when one looks back to these dark years of dense ignorance of not so long ago.

It was the terrible state of ignorance and misery among the workers which drew from Carlyle in 1838 those scathing denunciations of a society which allowed such things to be: he wondered, not at the rumours of rebellion, but that the workers were content to be quiet so long. Ruskin, Dickens, and others echoed his criticisms in their own individual ways.

Sanitary inquiries into the state of the crowded, hideous towns, the new industrial centres which had grown up so rapidly, began in 1840. The first medical officer of health was appointed in 1847, and legislation making compulsory the cleaning and draining of towns and houses was started in 1848. Experience taught Capitalism that over-exploitation did not pay; reluctantly it had to recognise its own harmful effects.

THE CHARTIST MOVEMENT (1838-1848).—The Chartist Movement was undoubtedly born out of the distress following the Industrial Revolution, for with the amelioration of the distress the movement disappeared. The only way by which workers could preserve their manhood was in revolt. The Chartists were in the proletarian wing of the movement which was endeavouring to secure political freedom in the first three decades of the 19th century right up to its success in the Reform Bill of 1832. Many of them were disappointed with the results of this Bill, and drew up a Charter demanding further reforms. Though their demands were political, yet many of them saw that these political demands were only a means to the end that they might win economic justice. Diverse in their aims and methods, with their chief strongholds in the towns, having many fine men within their ranks, aiding the workers in their strikes, and spreading much fear and alarm in the minds of the ruling classes, the Chartists and their movement, after several of their risings had been suppressed by the military, flickered out in 1848. For a while they joined with the

machinofacturers to repeal the Corn Laws, but the alliance was only a temporary one. Engels (p. 229) describes how the capitalists tried to use the workers as a catspaw to pull their chestnuts out of the fire. But the workers discovered that cheaper bread might mean, not more food, but less wages; the landlords were not their only enemies.

Reserving Trade Union development for our next lesson, it is worth while to notice the later start of Co-operation in 1844, following upon the collapse of the movement in 1833-34, the separate societies federating to form the English Wholesale in 1863. The history, successes, failings and future of the Co-operative Movement is too large a subject for discussion here. It is still largely part and parcel of the competitive system and represents the organised consumer rather than the producer. On its educational side while doing good work "to keep alive and diffuse the knowledge of the principles of the Co-operative Movement" in many respects it lacks clearness. Another example of the workers trying to improve their position is shown by the fact that friendly societies were formed and legally recognised and protected in the years 1829-50. Again, we hear of the formation of Workmen's Institutes and educational efforts. The worker was passing on from the Luddite machine-breaking stage to another, in which he sought to gain self-reliance and education in order to understand and remedy his condition.

"THE GRAND ERA OF CAPITALIST EXPANSION."— This occurred in the years from 1850 onwards. Trade went ahead by leaps and bounds. With America suffering from the effects of the Civil War, with Germany late in arriving at national unity, and France yet disturbed by external and internal trouble, England, thanks to the start given her by the Industrial Revolution, remained the first industrial nation of the world till about the year 1875. The capitalists could afford to pay their workmen fairly good wages and hence a higher standard of living was attained.

But that "standing feud between worker and master," which was so evident and bitter throughout the years of the Industrial Revolution, only temporarily disappeared in these years of prosperity, to reappear again more open and distinct than ever. The forces which will finally compel the workers to control the means of production are to be easily discerned if we have followed our lesson closely.

BOOKS:

Gibbins, Period V.

Capital, Vol. I., Chaps. X. and XV., on the working day and machinery and modern industry.

Craik, Section I. and V.

Hobson's *Evolution of Capitalism*. Chap. V. (Scott Publishing Company, 6s.).

Beard's *Industrial Revolution*.

Engels' *Conditions of Working Class in England*, 1844 (George Allen and Unwin, new edition shortly). No full knowledge of the effects of the Industrial Revolution upon the workers can be gained until this terrible collection of evidence is read.

Kingsley's *Alton Locke* (Dent, 2s.) contains interesting sidelights upon the Chartist Movement and the conditions of the poor.

Wage-Labour and Capital. (S.L.P., 3d.) A short examination of workings of Capitalism.

XVII.—TRADE UNIONISM FROM
1830 TO 1900

THE history of the Trade Unions will now be taken up where it was left in Outline XIV. In the various phases of Trade Unionism can be seen mirrored all the developments of England's Industrial History in the 19th century. Mention has already been made of how the condition of the workers depreciated from that of their Golden Age; of the distress and the high prices of food—wheat, for example, being 105s. per quarter in 1795—and of the social discontent, which honey-combed society with secret organisations and found expression in riotous disturbances and political agitations (at first mercilessly suppressed), that existed in the troubled years which followed upon the Industrial Revolution in the first quarter of the century.

Thorold Rogers tells us that the destruction of the iron lace-making frames at Nottingham, in 1811-12, by the displaced hand-workers, was punished by sentences of death, and other similar instances could be quoted. Assessments of wages by quarter sessions and compulsory apprenticeship were finally destroyed in 1814. The same writer informs us that, while the workers were in a desperate plight, "wealth was never more rapidly accumulated than in Yorkshire and Lancashire in the years 1800 to 1840"; and that, while the Factory Acts "were believed to be the deathblow to English manufacture, they have made labour more efficient, more intelligent, more decent, and more continuous, without trenching on profits."

The Trade Unions were able to come into the daylight after the Repeal of the Combination Act in 1824; and in their subsequent revival they attempted to make good for the long years of suppression, with the result that some of the old restrictions were re-imposed by the alarmed employers.

ATTEMPTS AT FEDERATION.—After the failure of many of the unions to weather the crisis of 1825, Trade Unionism became active once again. Recognising that sectionalism had been a source of weakness, plans for its removal were made. From the local trade club began to develop the national Trade Union; and attempts were made to federate various trades. The material conditions for these new developments were a general expansion of capitalist production and the great improvements in transport and communication. The unity of the workers was born of necessity. Collective bargaining had come to stay and increase, until membership of the Trade Union became a compulsory condition of employment.

Contemporaneously with this boom in Trade Unions vigorous political agitation continued up to the Reform Bill of 1832, which gave the middle class their desired triumph over the landed aristocracy, and left many of the workers disappointed.*

The following are examples of these early unions:—The Grand General Union of the United Kingdom, formed in 1829 by the Lancashire textile workers; The National Association for the Protection of Labour (connected with the name of Doherty), a federation of 150 trades, which lasted two years from its start in 1830; and the Builders' Union (1832-4), a federation of the building trades, especially strong in the Midlands and Liverpool, which was broken up by the frightened master-builders by means of the "document" and the lock-out.

THE OWENITE PERIOD.—In this period occurs the best known attempt at federation. It centres round the year 1834, and derives its name from Robert Owen. Born at Newtown in Montgomeryshire in 1771, Owen was a man of high intelligence, and a pioneer who laboured hard in the cause of progress. He had risen from a draper's assistant to a factory owner, and in his

* "When the middle class got their £10 franchise they did not see what the working class needed with votes."—G. J. Holyoake.

factory at New Lanark he showed his fellow-capitalists the advantages of treating their employees with consideration, instituted a system of co-partnership, and provided some wonderful schools for their education. His failure to arouse his middle-class associates—partially caused by his openly declared religious scepticism—drove him to the side of the wage-workers. He was one of the prime movers in the agitation which secured the first Factory Acts.

The federation which he formed in 1834, the Grand National Consolidated Union of Great Britain and Ireland, was more ambitious in its aims than any of its predecessors. Its founders hoped to supersede the capitalist economy and the State, and carry on production by means of this great union of workers. The disappointment of many of the advanced workers with the results of the 1832 Reform Bill caused them to join the Owenite movement, in order to try and win by industrial means what they had failed to win by political action.

Over half a million persons enrolled themselves in the G.N.C.; but few of them understood or shared the aims of its leaders. The general strike was to be its chief weapon. But though it possessed such magnificent ideals and roused such bitter animosity in the minds of the employers, the G.N.C. disappeared with its mission unaccomplished.

The reasons for its failure are not hard to discover. Its temporary success was due to the misery of the times, and not to an intelligent endorsement of any scheme. When dealing with the rise of Scientific Socialism, we shall endeavour to show that economic conditions were not ripe for the realisation of Owen's scheme, and that, however admirable his Utopia was, the logic of the machine had yet to complete its work before society could give birth to a new order emerging from the old, and not from the heads of idealists, however sincere those idealists might be.

After all, the G.N.C. was only a loose federation attempting to unite at the top. It indiscriminately

opened its arms to all comers. Rival unions in the same trades, and unions as diverse as those of the agricultural labourers, the chimney-sweeps, the Operative Bonnet Makers, and the Female Tailors all found a place in its ranks. Sectional interests demanded sectional strikes, and when these failed disaffection ensued. A lasting unity became impossible; the general strike, which was to usher in the "New Moral Era," and the "Villages of Harmony," began to appear an unlikely event. Thus the G.N.C. went down before the onslaught of the opposition which it aroused. The fierceness of this opposition is typified in the case of the Dorchester labourers, six of whom were transported for seven years on the charge of administering unlawful oaths. Those who seek "to falsify history in order to fortify reaction" endeavour vainly to make deadly parallels between the failure of the G.N.C. and the failure which awaits the claims and efforts of Industrial Unionism. But the intervening years have not been empty; the past has its lessons. Unity must begin, not at the top, but at the bottom. The amalgamation of all rival unions in the same industry must precede that greater unity and progress which Owen desired.

The rise of the Chartists, the beginning of the Co-operative Movement by the Rochdale Pioneers in 1844, and the triumph of the Corn Law League in 1846 have received previous treatment.

Chartism might be described as part of the travail by which machinofacture was delivered. In the prosperous years of "the grand era of capitalist expansion" which followed, it died away; and the workers, discarding all their former revolutionary hopes, settled down to build up stable, national organisations in their separate trades.

THE "MODEL UNIONS."—In the first half of the century wages fell steadily. Then, out of their increased profits, the employers, in order to retain their workmen, paid better wages. After 1848, revolutionary methods were discredited, and, disappointed by the failure of

the Chartist movement, many of the more militant workers emigrated.

Now, the Trade Unions, shelving all their former schemes for general unity, became a recognised part of society, trying to show the reasonableness of their claims. Ceasing to look to the past, not yet compelled to look toward the future, the unions modestly claimed "a fair day's wage for a fair day's work" and reconciled themselves to the present.

The "model" unions were highly centralised. The right to strike and the control of policy and finance were placed in the hands of permanent officials. This bureaucratic control made for the aggrandisement of the leaders and the forcing of the masses into inactivity. The diplomacy of the leaders, in negotiation with the employers, settled the disputes, while the rank and file remained in the background. Lengthy contracts were the order of the day. The friendly benefit side of the organisation was enlarged at the expense of the trade side. Huge reserve funds were built up. Outside thinkers tried to prove the harmony of interests between employers and workers. The Fixed Wage Fund theory was believed in.* Thus the unions subsidised their out-of-work members, provided in some cases emigration funds, tried to abolish overtime, and restricted the number of apprentices.

The employers, having at last recognised that the Trade Unions had "come to stay," found it convenient to deal with the union through its all-powerful executive, who, after a little negotiation, would bargain away the collective rights of the union members to make new wage claims for a lengthy period.

* According to this theory, £100 of wealth is produced; the cost of the raw material, wear and tear of machinery, and the profits of the employer are paid out of this, perhaps leaving only £20 as a wage fund. More than this the labourers could not get. All they could do was to keep, if they possibly could, the supply of labour low so that the £20 would yield larger individual shares to the fewer workmen. It assumed the rigidity of profits.

The Amalgamated Society of Engineers served as a pattern to other unions of the highly-centralised "new model unions." Allan and Newton were the chief spirits in getting together the eight unions which formed it in 1851. We read that it financially helped the building trades to the extent of £3,000 in 1859. The Carpenters and Joiners followed the A.S.E. pattern in 1861. Other unions adopting the same policy and structure were the Compositors, the Flint Glass Makers, Bookbinders, Ironmoulders, and the Potters.

Between 1841 and 1848 attempts were made to link the miners into a national union. Long before then, Northumberland and Durham miners had passed through some very bitter struggles. We are told of the doings of "the miners' attorney-general," W. P. Roberts, in connection with the association which was then started, only to die out in 1848. In 1860 the Yorkshire miners won the right of appointing a checkweigher. The *Western Mail*, of Aug. 20, 1869, reports a meeting at Pontypridd of delegates representing the colliers of Glamorgan and Monmouthshire, who decided "that a Union for South Wales be established from this day." After two other attempts had been made, the M.F.G.B. was formed in 1888 to be tested in the big lock-out of '93.

TRADES' COUNCILS.—While national unions in particular trades were being started, the branches of these unions often joined with each other to carry on local conflicts or agitate for the removal of some legal barriers; for though the model unions frowned upon strikes, these still took place; and though, remembering the failure of the Chartists, the workers were still in the "no politics in the union" stage, adverse judicial decisions and the need for protection of their funds drove the unions into politics.

Soon, in several of the big towns, permanent councils of the trades grew up, which served as rallying points for the agitation and "lobbying" that was necessary to secure legal recognition in 1871. "The

movement for the amendment of the Master and Servant Law was initiated by the Glasgow Trades Council, and resulted finally in the passing of the Master and Servant Act of 1867."

The London Trades Council was especially prominent, because working through it was the "Junta," or "Cabinet," of the Trade Union Movement. Several of the important unions had their offices in London, and the permanent paid officials of these centralised unions were able to work in close touch with each other. This Council was connected with The International of 1864 through Applegarth, Odger and Howell. The first acting as a delegate at Basel in 1869, the other two being on the committee along with Eccarius and "Dr. Marx" when the Second International was born. When the Royal Commission was appointed to inquire into Trade Unionism in 1867, the Unions secured the appointment of Frederick Harrison and Thomas Hughes (two prominent middle-class friends of Trade Unionism) upon it, and to supply them with information which largely influenced the findings of the Commission. At this time the employers were making strenuous efforts to smash the growing power of Trade Unionism by exploiting the public feeling excited by the Sheffield outrages, where a local union had resorted to "rattening" non-unionists and exploding cans of gunpowder. Also, the Lord Chief Justice, in 1867, had ruled that the Trade Unions, being illegal associations, could not take legal proceedings to prosecute any official if he absconded with union funds. The Junta, the most prominent figures in which were Allen (Engineers); Applegarth (Carpenters); Guile (Ironfounders); Coulson (London Order of Bricklayers), and Odger (connected with a small shoemakers' union), directed a counter agitation; and their efforts secured a legal status for the unions, and legal protection for their funds, in the Bill of 1871. While this Bill secured full recognition and expansion of the friendly side of the unions, it was accompanied by another stringently enforcing severe penalties

against "picketing," "intimidation," etc., which hampered all Trade Unions—strikes under such restrictions being still practically impossible. Further agitation secured the repeal of this measure in 1875, peaceful picketing then becoming permissible, and also in the same year the Master and Servant Act was repealed and another placed in its stead, giving both worker and employer the right of suing each other in a court of law for breach of contract.

THE TRADE UNION CONGRESS.—The need for common action by the unions and the Trades Councils gave birth to the Trade Union Congress. The Councils sent delegates to the Congress up to the year 1895, when their representation was destroyed, to prevent duplication of membership. The Congress was first held in Manchester in 1868, and was convened in London by the Junta in 1871 to help in the Repeal of the Criminal Law Amendment Act. Its Parliamentary Committee superseded the Junta, and the Congress became a regular institution. Thus in time, from the Lobby, Labour tried to go inside to make its influence more directly felt in politics. The Reform Bill of 1867, the Ballot Act of 1872, and another Reform Bill in 1884, helped to increase the political power of the working class. Congress sanctioned Parliamentary candidates in 1874, and Alexander Macdonald and Thomas Burt then entered Parliament.

THE AWAKENING AND ITS CAUSE.—However, it should be clearly understood that these political activities were made necessary in the 'seventies by the activity upon the industrial field which had excited the employers' hostility—expressed in judicial rulings and legal restrictions. For in the years 1871-5 there was a great extension of Trade Unionism. The Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants saw the light in 1871. In 1872, led by Joseph Arch, the agricultural labourers formed a union (which finally collapsed in 1894). The Engineers and Builders fought for a nine-hour day. On the other side we hear of the National Federation of Employers in 1873.

The slump of 1876-9 caused only a temporary disappearance of this militancy; and in the 'eighties the "new unionism" comes into prominence, spreading among unskilled workers, hitherto unorganised, and often despised by the aristocratic craft unions.

Before noticing the difference between the model unions and the new unions a survey of England's industrial position will help us to grasp the true cause of this militancy. The splendid start England had received from the Industrial Revolution and her consequent prosperity have already been pointed out. While trade went ahead by "leaps and bounds" the capitalist could afford to let a few crumbs fall to the workers from his well-spread table. But when the British capitalists were losing their unchallenged supremacy, when their competitors—chiefly American and German—were catching up to them, then the employers were forced to cut down expenses, and were less disposed to listen to the demands of their employees. Even during the years of rapid expansions, crises had not been absent; but now they became prolonged in their effects. The capitalists of other nations, too, sought for markets in which to dispose of their surplus products. Capitalism, like a huge banyan tree, strikes its branches down into the soil of every land, and each branch taking root, itself becomes a part of the tree, sending out still more branches in search of foothold. The country, which to-day is a market, by to-morrow will have imported machinery and become a rival competitor, needing markets herself:

From now on to the end of the century a change can be seen coming over the structure and policy of the Trade Unions. The new unions organised the growing mass of unskilled workers who had no craft to preserve. They had a lower scale of benefit; and ordinary contributions and smaller reserve funds, and relied upon fighting rather than conciliation to gain their demands. The policy of the model unions was founded upon the recognition of the essential goodwill of the employer; but increased friction undermined the old ideas of

harmony between master and man, though these old ideas even persist in our own day, and the breaking away from them is often performed unconsciously.

With the change in policy, the disappearance of lengthy contracts, and the decrease of reserve and benefit funds, came a change in the structure of the unions. The highly-centralised union, dominated by its officials, who relied upon diplomacy and negotiation, did not respond quickly enough to the feelings of the rank and file. The leaders of the new unionism tried hard to stir the leaders of the old unions from a "craft consciousness" to a "class consciousness." "John Burns and Tom Mann were among the foremost critics of the 'aristocratic' organisations, with their high contributions and lack of militancy, with their miserly solicitude for funds and exclusive attention to friendly benefits, and their apathy and lack of vigour with respect to advancing the industrial position of the wage-labourer—especially that of the unskilled working men and women."*

In 1887 the Dockers' Union was born, and in 1889 the famous Dock Strike in London occurred. Ben Tillett has described how the "docker's tanner" was won, and how the horrors of the terrible system of the "call on" were removed by this strike, in his *Brief History of the Dockers' Union*. Previous to this, in 1888, with the help of Mrs. Besant, the match girls of Bryant & May successfully struck to better their conditions. The Gasworkers' and General Labourers' Union won an eight-hour day for the London gas stokers.

Trusting the reader will look up the excellent books, now easily available, for further particulars of the advances made in this period, brief mention will be made, before concluding this Outline, of the propaganda bodies which at this time came into existence. Formerly the unions strove only to remove legal restrictions by their political action, their leaders being

* W. W. Craik, in *Railway Review*.

impregnated with the individualism of the times; but new conceptions were abroad regarding the way out. The aim of the Trade Unions, "a fair day's wage for a fair day's work" was altered by the influence of new ideas, which were collectivist rather than individualist. The impossibility of getting "a fair day's wage" and the need of a more fundamental change began to be recognised. The wide circulation of Henry George's *Progress and Poverty* played a part in the creation and discussion of new ideas.

PROPAGANDA BODIES.—"In the year 1881, an attempt was made," wrote Bax and Morris, "to federate the various Radical Clubs of London under the name of the Democratic Federation. Part of the heterogeneous elements, mainly the mere political Radicals, of which this was composed, withdrew from it in 1883; but other elements connected with the intellectual and literary side of Socialism joined it, and soon after the body declared for unqualified Socialism, and took the name of the Social Democratic Federation." The S.D.F. reduced the Marxian theory of development to a "rigid orthodoxy." The backward state of the Trade Unions gave it no hope from that quarter; and though it joined the Labour Party when the latter was formed, it soon broke away because the Trade Unionists were not advanced enough to share its views.

The Fabian Society was another Socialist body started in 1884. Mostly composed of middle-class people, it helped to permeate Liberalism with collectivist ideas. It was frankly opportunistic; out to "break the spell of Marxism"; and distinctly "British" in its economics. It "glossed over the class struggle," and attempted to organise society from a consumer's point of view. With its excellent literature it has paved the way for the coming of State Socialism.

The Independent Labour Party, formed in 1893, came more into touch with the Trade Unions than any of the preceding propaganda bodies. Since their formation the New Unions had been active, and the I.L.P.

was a manifestation of this new spirit on the political field. It was an attempt to permeate the Trade Unions with Socialism and create an independent political party to displace the Lib-Labs of the Broadhurst, Burt and Fenwick type. The Swansea Congress of 1887 was the scene of a conflict between the new and "the owd gang," personified respectively in Keir Hardie and Henry Broadhurst.

THE END OF THE CENTURY.—Owing to the fall in the cost of living, due to improvements in production and national competition, the industrial unrest was delayed for some time. The end of the century saw the number of Trade Unionists gradually increasing; the 1½ millions of 1898 increased to nearly 2½ in 1910.

The General Federation of Trade Unions began in 1899 to attempt to realise its ideal of a million members and "a gigantic central fund," proving that the money bags method survives, though obsolete.

In 1898 occurred the strike of 22 weeks out of which emerged the South Wales Miners' Federation. Prior developments to this event—the operation of the Sliding Scale, the doings of the Cambrian Miners' Association and the several strikes—are as yet unrecorded, and their tale should be told while some of the people who took an active part in them, and who remember even farther back, are still with us. The same might be said about other districts and other organisations. There is much information of this kind wanting collection and attention. From the local craft unions (*e.g.*, hauliers' and hewers') and the individual colliery owners or small companies came the need of a definite united organisation on both sides. The men financially helping that section of their fellows who were out of work by fighting for the wage advance, formed contacts which helped to clear the way for a larger unity.

The spirit of revolt against the old structure, the friction between the leader and the mass, and the continued activity on the industrial and political fields

were general characteristics of the Trade Union movement which did not cease with the century.

BOOKS:

Gibbins, Period V.

Craik, Sections III., IV., and VI.

Trade Unions, by Jos. Clayton (People's Books, 1s.) contains in a condensed, readable, and cheaper form much information for which the student generally consults the bulkier volumes of Webb's *The History of Trade Unionism and Industrial Democracy*. (Longmans.)

XVIII.—TRADE UNIONISM, 1900-1914

WE have followed the Trade Unions in their progress from illegal secret societies, with their hand against every man, to legally recognised law-abiding bodies, with sane and responsible leaders and policies; from wild schemes of general unions, with revolutionary aims, to the "model" unions with their huge reserve and benefit funds and their highly centralised structure.

We have seen how changing material conditions destroyed the anti-strike policy, and the "no politics in the union" stage of the organisations, by reviving the hostility between the two classes; how the alarmed capitalist class used their legal and political power to hamper the growth of the unions, thus forcing them to take up the issue in the political field; how these conditions produced the "new unionism," differing in policy and structure from the old; and how new schools of thought and propagandist bodies, working through the Trade Unions, gave fresh aims and new ideas and methods to the Trade Unionists. An explanation as to why militancy was so long delayed was also offered. The first years of the 20th century were chiefly occupied with the political phase of this militancy, and for very good reasons.

POLITICAL ACTIVITY.—Undoubtedly it was the backwardness of the craft unions which caused so much faith to be placed in political action. The new unions openly adopted it, and one by one the older unions were forced to see its usefulness. Many of the workers hoped to achieve a unity and independence upon the political field which the craft unions and their policy prevented them from getting on the industrial field. Many of them, too, being State Socialists, had hopes of electing sufficient Labour M.P.'s to be able to "legislate in" a new state of affairs, which would bring for the worker more certain and lasting gains

in the way of better conditions than those obtained by him in his industrial efforts. They had the idea that the political machinery of Capitalism could be taken over. As if political unity and strength could be obtained before industrial unity and strength! Laws are not the horses of the chariot of progress; in actual fact, the politicians are ever striving with their measures and constant amendments to catch up to industrial development.

Yet, in dealing with the breakdown of peace between the workers and their employers and its industrial and political manifestations, it should be remembered that progress was slow. New ideas, generated in new conditions, filtered but slowly into the heads of the workers; ideas stubbornly persist long after development has made them obsolete. The independence of Labour was realised only in a nominal fashion. Only a few of the more advanced workers recognised the divorce of interests between the old parties and the new one.

For numbers and names of Labour representatives, from 1874 till 1910, the reader should consult Part III. of the *Labour Year Book* (1916) and the 1919 issue for more recent information. The Labour Representation Committee, which in 1906 became the Labour Party, was formed in 1900 by Trade Unions, Socialist and other kindred organisations. The alliance of the older unions to form the Labour Party resulted, not from a general conversion of their rank and file to Socialism by the propagandist bodies—though this may have been a contributing factor—but, as in their previous history, they were again forced into politics in order to safeguard their own position.

The employers were disturbed at the aggressive policy of the militant New Unionism, which carried on vigorous attacks upon non-unionism. In 1898 the *Allen v. Flood* law case showed how they endeavoured to limit the growing powers of the Trade Unions. Two non-unionists, discharged by their employers at the suggestion of a union official representing their

fellow-workmen, who otherwise would have struck, brought an action against Allen, the union official. The magistrates decided that he had "maliciously induced the employers to discharge them," and awarded damages to Flood and Taylor. This decision was, however, reversed by the House of Lords.

Another case, *Quinn v. Leatham*, in 1901, did not end so favourably for the unions. The well-known Taff Vale Case was the occasion of another adverse decision which made instant action necessary by the Trade Unions. The Taff Vale Railway Company were granted damages against the A.S.R.S. because some of its members, acting upon official instructions, had "watched" and "beset" blacklegs, thus preventing them from entering into the service of the railway company. "The result of this decision was that the funds of the unions became liable for damages for the wrongful acts of their agents; the damages and costs of the action cost the union over £46,000, and Trade Union officials and Labour leaders were astonished and dismayed at the result." The Trade Unions were left in a dangerous position; they could not take legal action against their members, yet they could be sued for the doings of those members, and their accumulated funds were now in peril.

The political activity and agitation caused by this situation had its effect in the Trades Disputes Act of 1906. This Act made "peaceful picketing" lawful, took away the right of the capitalist to recover damages for loss of trade in a dispute from the funds of the union, and prevented a Trade Union being sued for the acts of its members.

However, another attempt was made, in 1908, to find "a weakspot in the armour of the Trade Unions" by the famous Osborne Judgement. This case challenged the right of the Trade Unions to meddle in politics at all, and decided that a union could not make a compulsory levy for Parliamentary representation. Injunctions were granted against many of the unions, and the position was only remedied by the Trade

Union Act of 1913, which recognised the right of the unions to use their funds for political purposes, but ordered that such funds should be kept separate, and that any person having a conscientious objection to paying for benefits received by him, should, by filling up a form, have the right of exemption. The unions so far have not been strong enough to secure compulsion in this matter; the battle is unfinished.

The Workmen's Compensation Act of 1897, the Miners' Eight Hour Bill and Old Age Pensions of 1908, and the Minimum Wage and National Insurance Acts of 1912 were events of this period. Before turning to the industrial activity which followed the disappointment of the high hopes of 1906, it should be noticed that the failure of the craft union outlook revealed itself upon the political field. No party can be "farrarder" than its members, and the workers, as a whole, do not possess that class-consciousness which is necessary to successful action upon both fields. When that is achieved, the Labour Party will no longer be emasculated by reformism, and content to be the useful ally of another party. Parliament can afford to disdain the protests of a Grayson or a Lansbury, just because these protests are not backed by industrial might. The M.P. of the future, having this, will compel attention; "the scaffolding" of the industrial commonwealth must needs be built.

LABOUR UNREST.—While there are many contradictory explanations of the Industrial Unrest, which lasted from 1906 to the outbreak of the European War, its existence is admitted by all. Before investigating its causes, we will enumerate some of the chief incidents in which it was manifested.

In 1906 and 1907 there was a series of local strikes in South Wales over the non-unionist question; and in the latter year the "all-grades movement" of the railwaymen threatened a stoppage, only avoided by the intervention of Mr. Lloyd George with his Conciliation Boards machinery.

A fifteen years' peace was broken in the cotton industry in 1908 by a seven weeks' strike, followed by another in 1909. In the same year, contrary to their officials' advice, the N.E. engineers struck and in 1910 the Boilermakers won a contest, in spite of the stubborn resistance of the employers and also the opposition of their own officials.

The year 1911 saw a brief strike among the railwaymen and successful agitation by the transport workers. The M.F.G.B. secured in 1912 the minimum wage principle by a six weeks' national strike. 1,462 disputes, involving 677,254 workers, took place in 1913, one of which was the famous Dublin strike. The outbreak of the war curtailed a prolonged dispute in the London building trade, where the employers had locked out their men for refusing to work with non-unionists.

FALSE "CAUSES."—To explain and understand the cause of a disease is to make the first step towards its cure. Many explanations and cures were put forward in relation to this undeniable disease of the 20th century, Industrial Unrest.* Some of the attempts at explanation need not detain us long. We can afford to quickly dismiss the theory advanced by the conservative person who thinks that the present discontent is the result of the workers having lost their respect for their betters, and who sighs for the "good old days" when children were not sent to school till they were 13 years of age. True, education of the right sort is a lever of progress, but much that is now taught in the schools has to be deliberately unlearned in later life, and only in an indirect fashion is general education the cause of industrial unrest.

Time would also be wasted in dealing at length with the theory which ascribed the growing unrest to the increase of selfishness; whose advocates advance an ethical solution to the problem. The sufferings in the industrial warfare and the beauties of peace are en-

* For more recently assigned causes and cures, consult Reports of Commission of Inquiry into Industrial Unrest (1916), No. 7 (South Wales) being especially interesting.

larged upon by these pacifists. But they ignore the present hard situation. Classes cannot love each other while one of them is busy not praying *for*, but preying *upon*, the other.

Another theory attributed the cause of unrest to climatic conditions. Workmen felt disinclined to work in the hot summer days, and it was supposed that it only needed a trifling dispute to provoke a stoppage. Though this theory is not so high up in the clouds as the former one, yet it located the cause of the disturbance far enough away to be out of man's reach. Its superficiality is obvious; a strike is a grim holiday. Behind strikes there is an economic heat, engendered by the friction between master and man, of which learned writers are unaware. Not having had any experience of the class-struggle, they doubt its existence.

The Great Man Theory was also brightened up to do duty on this occasion. Able agitators, with their inflammatory speeches and writings, were said to be the cause of the trouble. But though able speakers and writers do considerably help to awaken industrial unrest, they only focus attention upon facts; they cannot create them.

FALSE CURES.—Many cures were put forward as certain remedies. The boasted panacea, Free Trade, having failed to prevent unemployment—the unemployment returns of the Trade Unions in 1908, for example, rising from 4.3 to 9.1 per cent.—a return to tariff protection was proposed. Those who would build up a tariff wall around the nation forgot, however, that there is "an enemy within the gates," *i.e.*, the capitalist; who, though he points out how national trade is decreased and unemployment created by the free imports produced by machinery and cheap foreign labour, has no scruples about introducing machinery and cheap labour himself, if he has the opportunity.

Other cures coming from the bourgeois physicians were schemes of profit-sharing and co-partnership,

which claimed to unite master and worker in one common interest and prevent all further unrest. These schemes have, on the whole, failed; they have been well likened to a rider, seated upon the back of a donkey, who enjoys a speedier transit by enticing the beast to travel at a faster rate in order to gain a carrot which its rider for ever dangles ahead of its nose.

Another "red herring" was the attempt of the Workers' Educational Association to revive the old ideology of the 1850-70 period, when it was believed that it was only necessary for master and man to understand each other's viewpoint and they would recognise their identity of interest and become the best of friends. Many well-meaning "meliorists" may be found in this organisation. The State and the Universities are looked to for financial and mental aid as if the industrial and political foe can be an educational friend. Even Gibbins' text-book—excellent in many respects—may be disagreed with on this point of the value of the W.E.A. (See pages 220 and 231.) An organisation thus foolishly hoping to accomplish the impossible, to reconcile the irreconcilable, is not to be trusted with the teaching of the social sciences to the workers. Testimonials to the success of the "impartial" W.E.A. as an antidote to industrial unrest, from opponents of this unrest, are not hard to find.

Minor consequences arising were Governmental inquiries into methods of conciliation and arbitration adopted by other countries to settle industrial disputes. Beyond the creation of an Industrial Council, no attempt was made to embody the result of these inquiries in any legal enactment. Labour Exchanges and the Insurance Act but tinkered with the real problem.

TRUE CAUSES.—Having "cleared the ground," we can estimate the true causes; they were:—

(1) A rise in the cost of living. The "mitigating factor" which had delayed militancy now ceased. Real wages diminished from 1897 onwards. Prices rose, and the workers, then as ever, stood to lose in a rising

market because they cannot quickly raise their wages to follow the soaring prices.

One important factor which caused prices to rise was the cheapening of gold resulting from the application of science and machinery such as new stamps, tubular roll crushers, high explosives and electricity to gold-mining, thus enhancing the price of other commodities in relation to gold.

The costs of Imperialism, by raising taxation, also increased the cost of living, and provoked unrest by lowering the standard of life. "The closest and most malign influence," says Gibbins, "was that of the South African War (1899-1902) which, after at first giving an impetus to the trades supplying the munitions of war, left behind it a legacy of debt, increased military and naval expenditure, and widespread depression in trade, with consequent unemployment during the 'lean years' which followed. The National Debt in 1898-99, before the outbreak of war, stood at £638,000,000, but had risen by 1903-4 to £798,000,000, or to the level of 1870, thus wiping out in four years the laborious debt reductions of more than 30 years." The verdict of future historians upon modern events, when the ravages of war-fever have subsided, should be interesting.

(2) The further introduction of machinery, with all its accompanying intensification of labour, growth of unskilled processes and unemployed workers. So far, in Britain Taylorism or Scientific Management has not been introduced on a large scale. Those who have read Munsterburg's *Applied Psychology* and such-like books will know that this is at any rate receiving a great deal of attention, if not as yet wide application.

* As explained by the Labour Theory of Value the process takes place thus: The gold, containing less labour, would be of less value; therefore it would need more gold to purchase the same amount of other commodities than before, provided, of course, that the value of these commodities had not also been decreased in the same way. Hence the purchasing power of the workers' wages would be smaller.

The forces which became prominent in the Industrial Revolution have not ceased their operation. The concentration of capital, the growth of the big business and the need for larger starting capitals may all be noted. Capitalism proceeds to its dissolution.

(3) Another true cause of Industrial Unrest, and one arising out of the general laws of capitalist production, is the fact that, besides the decrease in real wages and the growth of unemployment, as outlined above, the relative wages of the labourer decrease also. The rate of profit may be less, but its mass is greater. The contrast between luxury and poverty becomes more glaring. The luxurious motor in the street, the display in the shop windows illustrating the heights reached by modern production, and the dress and leisure of the well-to-do—these are things which emphasise to the worker the poverty of his own position, the lowness of his standard of life.

THE TRUE CURE.—To sum up the causes of Industrial Unrest, it might be said truly that it is the logical outcome, the inevitable result, of the development of the capitalist system. Passing on to deal with its consequences upon the policy and structure of the Trade Unions, we shall see the true cure and the solution to the problem in the making.

The strongest tendency in the modern Trade Union movement is one to secure unity; amalgamation is the order of the day. The unions are being driven to revise their basis, policy and structure by necessity born of experience. Different ideals as to their importance in the future society prevail from those which obtained when Collectivism and political activities were predominant.

The policy of diplomacy and skilled bargaining becomes more out of date. The lengthy agreement makes way for a shorter.

The old bureaucratic centralisation is found to be a hindrance to mass action. We noticed, in some of the unofficial strikes, friction between the leaders and the led. *The problem is to secure democratic control without*

sacrificing efficiency; to get all grades and sections of the industry into the Industrial Union without getting any of the sectional interests snowed under. Some of the unions have already tackled these problems. The departmentalisation and the detail work cannot be decided offhand by outsiders. The need for efficiency necessitates alert intelligence. The experience in getting control of the organisation will be invaluable in the control of industry.

When the union is no longer a sick and death club, when the class antagonism is clearly understood, and when craft-consciousness has made way for class-consciousness, then the aim of the unionists will be to give "the knock-out blow" to the true cause of Industrial Unrest.

Despite all the prophecies we hear from the pacifists of the finish of war upon the industrial field, the effects of the present crisis will be to hasten and not change the development of the forces which we have seen are immanent in the capitalist system. The shortage of male labour has stimulated rather than started the dilution of labour and the use of labour-saving machinery. Our newspapers and illustrated papers contain ample evidence of the rapidity of this process. The true meaning of State control has been forcibly learnt. In its two centuries of life, Trade Unionism has fought its way upward into importance, in spite of the obstacles placed in its way. And who shall say what it will accomplish in the future? The class which has opposed it will, when the workers have the power to think and the will to do, be deposed by this its conquering rival.

BOOKS:

Gibbins, Period V. Craik, Sections VII.-XI.

Cole's *World of Labour* (Bell, 5s.), for details of the present state of Trade Unionism, abroad as well as at home.

The Miners' Next Step (1912) attracted much attention in Parliament and elsewhere on its publication. Issued by an Unofficial Reform Committee inside the S.W.M.F., it deserves the attention of the student as a clear statement of the aims and policy of the advanced section of trade or industry unionism. Mr. W. H. Mainwaring, the Committee Secretary, confesses to only one effective criticism:—"It is not so much a 'step' as a whole 'staircase.'"

XIX.—THE THREE PERIODS OF CAPITALISM

RIGHT at the beginning of this Series, which is now drawing to a close, the theory of history, that was going to be consciously applied throughout, was unfolded. It has served our purpose and made clear and explained the facts of industrial development in a way no other theory could. Made bold by success, we are going forward, in this Outline, beyond our textbooks. Even they in their closing chapters hint at changes which they recognise as coming; but living in later times, we can see those changes, of which they only had an inkling, with all their tragic results in a more advanced stage.

Will the theory, which has served us so admirably in the past, help us to understand modern happenings? If it will not, then it will be finally discredited. Like a geographer turned explorer, who leaves the facts undisputed to discover the shape of lands hitherto unknown, whose position and size have not yet been correctly determined, we now attack recent historical events above and about which the mists of controversy still hover. If our instruments are of true worth, with them we shall be able to locate and measure these new lands and place them upon the map in their correct latitude and longitude.

A study of history helps one to get "the big look" upon events. How many of the supposed causes of the present war will receive mention in the history books of the future? The religious animosity between Spain and England, Captain Jenkins' ear, the breaking of "scraps of paper," and the power of great malignant personalities grow small and dim when the cloth of history as a whole is spread before us in the truthful light of time. This we have seen, whilst tracing truer patterns. Therefore, brushing aside many of the causes advanced, the appeals to primitive and age-long national prejudice to prove that one particular nation or race has a monopoly of the vices, and leaving

the student to weigh their worth and clear the ground of them at his leisure, the task before us is to explain in a scientific manner how and why Imperialism came into being. The growth and decay of Feudalism, and the birth and various moods of Capitalism have been followed. Can we then follow and explain the reason for this her latest mood? If we cannot apply successfully our theory to such a change, to such an important collection of facts, it will stand condemned. If we can, then our method of looking upon society and showing its evolution will be confirmed in its value. Moreover, we shall be able to safely use it in guiding our actions and forming our attitude in the present and in the future. There is nothing particularly modern or capitalistic about a policy of conquest or war. The children of the dragons' teeth have been very short-lived and few in number. Under no system of society has war existed for the sake of war; it has always had an object varying in time and place. Hunting grounds, fertile plains, flocks, slaves, woods, seas, women and many forms of wealth were the causes of primitive wars. A love of fighting and military ardour may persist for awhile after the economic conditions, the scarcity of food or need for expansion, out of which they originated, have disappeared; but not for long are they regarded as necessary virtues. Like as in other systems, Capitalism had, and has, definite historical purposes behind its wars.

I.—The First Warlike Period.

It is only necessary to briefly recall how the nation came into being with the growth of the national market, and the break-up of Feudalism and the local Guild production. Formerly, in Europe there had been many little separate feudal domains, owning in many cases only a nominal obedience to an overlord. The Roman Church, ruled by its Pope, possessing the widely used Latin language, was the only connecting link between them all. We followed the rise of forces which, in the Reformation, snapped that link

and saw how the merchant class in the Tudor period allied itself with absolute monarchy in order to overcome the feudal barons. Very early in the 16th century, following the successful voyages of Columbus and Vasco da Gama, began the foundation of the commercial Empires in the East and West by the Portuguese, the Dutch, the Spaniards, the French, and, last of all, the English. The subsequent rivalry extended into the 17th and 18th centuries. Which nation should secure the wealth of the new worlds then being discovered? That was the question about which war occurred in this period. The piracy of the Elizabethan heroes, the slave-trading, robbery, looting, and murder which surrounded primitive accumulation are probably still fresh in the student's mind. Gradually, as this accumulation made it possible for capitalist production to get under way, and as the nature of the discovered lands and their occupants altered, the relations between the oversea and the home lands changed, piracy and the search for the precious metals lessened and trade increased. But in this period it is important to notice that no nation would allow another to trade with its colonies. "Trade followed the flag." England, enjoying a fine island seaboard, had no need to "march to the sea," as Russia and Germany had, and, as we have already seen, the wars of the 17th and 18th centuries, waged against our changing "natural enemies" from the Spanish Armada to the end of the Seven Years' War, left her in command of the markets and the carrying trade of the world. Again and again she benefited from her insularity by escaping the indescribable devastation suffered repeatedly by her European competitors.

Mercantile economy, aiming to keep a balance of trade against the foreigner by import duties and to foster home industries by bounties and home shipping by Navigation Acts, is the ideal expression of the material needs of this mood of Capitalism.

II.—The Pacific Period.

This can be placed roughly in the first three-quarters of the 19th century. Doubts have been made as to its existence, but the wars which did occur in this period were only punitive expeditions. India, a lasting survival of the commercial empire of the East, was largely the key to the policy behind those wars. New ideas about colonies and freedom of trade then came into being. Adam Smith previously, and many of his famous followers later, ably attacked the old notions of monopoly and restriction. Let the colonies, they proclaimed, trade with whom they were naturally best fitted to trade and let each industry be carried on where natural conditions were best suited for it. Colonies to them were costly "white elephants." Let the American colonies have their freedom if they so desired. The quality and cheapness of the commodity should count and not its nationality. The trader should be able to sell under any flag.

Thanks to the Industrial Revolution, the capitalist class could thus fling aside all its early protective aids; English textiles, then our leading industry, only needed "the open door" into every market and their triumph was assured. In the less civilised nations of the earth it saw potential consumers of its commodities, so Capitalism wished them well in their forward march to civilisation. The Manchester school believed in "splendid isolation" from other people's quarrels, in a Liberalism of peace, retrenchment and reform, in order that political liberty and self-government might be the lot of all. In theory it believed in "liberating nations oppressed by alien tyranny" and in "liberty for national evolution." However, with the destruction of their economic basis—England's industrial supremacy—these ideas were cold-shouldered. "For in spite of the confidence of the Manchester school that for the future wars would become fewer and fewer, and that commerce and peace would go hand in hand, the progress of events has shown that this confidence was misplaced. The

19th century, tempestuous in its childhood, and then peaceful in its youth and manhood, has become quarrelsome in its dotage." We shall see why.

III.—The Second Warlike Period.

SIGNIFICANT EVENTS.—Before laying bare the economic factors behind this change, the following events should be noticed as indicating the transition. Even as early as 1850, Palmerston had laid it down that British citizens and property in other lands should be protected by force. The strong protests from all sides showed the strength of the peace forces; the times were not then evidently ripe for the open acceptance of this doctrine, which was fated to have immense consequences upon later foreign policy and relations.

The wide application of this dictum was seen clearly in 1882, when "splendid isolation" was made forever impossible by the occupation of Egypt. That Bright resigned from Gladstone's Cabinet as a protest against this affair demonstrates the persistence of the Manchester outlook. To the shopkeeper we have seen the flag and the fleet were of little use; but to the usurer wishing "to safeguard the interest on a usurious loan" they meant the power to foreclose. Egypt was such a foreclosure.

Boudin cites the cession of Heligoland to Germany as late as the year 1890 as another proof of England's slow conversion to Imperialism in all its implications. The ideas about colonies, however, began to undergo a change; in 1895 Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, passing by what had been usually thought to be more important offices, chose to occupy the position of Colonial Secretary, and later a return to Protection is advocated. The South African War, the huge increase in armaments, the grouping and rivalry of the nations, the constant friction and the awkward situations which arose as the nations "rattled into barbarism" and the last dread catastrophic culmination, these are familiar to us all. The spark and the explosion demand

attention, if the already laid train of powder has gone unnoticed.

THE REFLEX IN IDEAS AND POLITICS.—In proof that men's social life determines their consciousness, a change in the intellectual outlook and political policy can be also clearly seen. Tennyson, as a poet in the early 19th century, looked forward to "the Parliament of man" and "the Federation of the world" when the war drums would beat no longer and the battle flags be furled. Other thinkers before had made out plans for perpetual peace. Theoretically these philosophers were republicans and they believed in the natural equality of man. The earlier capitalist economists thought it was simply ignorance, and not any racial or national defect, that kept backward peoples from conforming to the "natural" laws of capitalist production, and of buying cheap and selling dear. They saw no reason why all peoples should not become civilised; even the savage could learn the blessings of sustained and regular effort and become a consumer of Manchester goods. Once ignorance was gone any people could draw abreast and become the equal of other peoples. All these philosopher-economists asked from the State was that it should not hinder "natural" development. Chattel slavery wiped out potential customers; it could not be justified by the colour of the skin and the removal of oppression would open up further advances. These and other commendable ideas found expression in many quarters even till quite recently.

However, a great change has come; social relations have altered, as we shall later see. In the leading countries the duty of carrying "the white man's burden" is being preached. Instead of welcoming peace we are told of "the healthiness of God's medicine, war," of the enervating effects of peace upon the moral fibre, of superior and inferior peoples, of the domination of the world by the white aristocracy and of how fatherland must be lifted above humanity. The "craving for colonies" manifests itself. Ideas of

theocracy are revived and kings are needed to inspire reverence and loyalty in the backward peoples—a loyalty based on fear. The State is exalted high; its aid is necessary to industry and its will is absolute. These new ideas are not peculiar to any land; if there are differences of expression and strength they are only of degree and not of kind.

THE PEACEFUL DISPOSAL OF A TEXTILE SURPLUS.—As we have discovered previously, the production of a surplus is the primary motive of Capitalism. The capitalist's desire to enlarge the surplus product, or lengthen the surplus part of the working-day, comes into conflict with the wage-labourer's endeavour to lessen and shorten it. Hence the class struggle to which we shall again refer. Under Capitalism, then, not only do the workers produce more value than they receive in wages, but the commodities in which is contained that surplus value they have produced as well as the value of their labour-power (*i.e.*, their wages)—these commodities are too great for the needs of society itself. They must be sold outside and become changed into something that the producing society does require. The haunting problem of capitalist society, ever since the Industrial Revolution enabled production to overtake the demand, has been to find new markets for the products which the home markets could not absorb. Mention has already been made of the crisis—a time when these surplus products temporarily glut the market. This insatiable need for new markets and new customers makes Capitalism a civilising agency. While textiles was England's premier industry, the need of creating new consumers of cotton goods made the capitalists in favour of bringing forward all the backward nations of the earth to the European standard. The savage could be inspired by new wants and desires and later converted to appreciate "steady and regular bodily and mental exertion." The shopkeeper's prosperity was bound up with the welfare of his customers. Wars disturbed and interrupted trade. The cheapness of

his commodities ignored the colour of the flag they were sold under. If a landlord mercilessly racked his tenants and revived the horrors of chattel slavery—as, say, Belgium in the Congo—then opinion and pressure must be applied to end this destruction of possible customers. Norman Angell's *Great Illusion* should be read as a modern statement of this pacific outlook and as a summing up of the economic forces which were in the Manchester period apparently making for peace. The economic basis for his ideas had already been changed by the time he gave them expression.

THE CAUSES OF THE CHANGE.—The real factors in bringing about the transition to Imperialism are:—

- (1) The change in the nature of the product for which a market must be found by the most highly developed capitalist nations.
- (2) The need for fields of investment abroad for the accumulating profits.
- (3) The increasing rivalry in procuring the lessening supplies of the raw materials that modern production demands.

All these factors interlock in working; the banks and the iron and steel industries work hand in glove with each other. Mixed with these are two minor factors whose profitable vested interest in Imperialism is very obvious:—

- (1) The machinations of armament mongers directly benefiting by war.
- (2) The influence exerted by the people who hold the jobs connected with the ruling of inferior peoples.

A SURPLUS IN IRON AND STEEL.—If we can prove and understand the main factors, the others will not detain us long. To countries in a lower stage of development, *Capitalism at first sends commodities for consumption—this is the peaceful period. Later, instead of the commodities to be used in consumption commodities to be used in production—i.e., machinery—are sent.* Like the banyan tree, it is ever spreading farther and farther, flinging down its roots and reproducing itself as it

goes. The less developed countries now produce textiles for themselves. And not only for themselves, but for others; for example, Japan, a former market for Lancashire textiles, is now competing with and driving out the Lancashire products from the Chinese market. In the higher developed countries the iron and steel industries displace the textile industry from its place of importance. This can be seen in many of the larger British colonies where they are not purely agricultural as formerly, but are using their mineral wealth in their own iron and steel foundries and engineering shops. The surplus product, therefore, is now locomotives, cars, rails, machinery, pipe lines for oil, mining machinery, grain elevators, motors for land and sea, etc., instead of textiles. To dispose of the latter was comparatively simple; but to dispose of the former it is necessary that large "civilising projects" of building huge railways and warehouses, and of constructing irrigation schemes, harbours and canals must be conceived. Then comes the question: How are these projects to be paid for and the foreign investor safeguarded? The method of payment adopted is the granting of a "concession" to the "concessionaires" which includes certain monopoly rights of trade, possession of mineral-bearing land or a direct money payment. "The flag is now an asset." For the nation, with all its armed force and its diplomats, stands behind its own particular group of concession hunters. Colonies are now extremely valuable to the mother country: Just as in the first warlike mood of Capitalism no nation allowed another to deal with its colonies, so now it would be unthinkable that Germany should be allowed to build a railway in Egypt or India. Free Trade does not apply to iron and steel. To gain "spheres of influence," to have the right of "economic penetration" in unexploited countries, the rival national groups compete with each other, their respective navies and armies in the background being the final arbiters. "In our epoch nations fight chiefly for raw products and markets and for the security of

these two factors through political power." The German capitalists with their Bagdad railway project, begun in 1898, would have disposed of some of their surplus steel and iron goods and received "a mortgage on the future" of some of the richest lands of modern times to pay for them. This project was to have been cut in two by the Russian occupation of Constantinople.

When once this economic basis of Imperialism is understood, the recent events of history and the happenings recorded in the daily newspapers can be interpreted in a lucid fashion. The leadership of Germany in the procession, according to Boudin, is that, owing to her late development, she skipped the middle pacific period of Capitalism and leapt from the Nationalistic to the Imperialistic stage at once. She found the world largely shut to her iron and steel goods and to her capital by the ring of her established competitors. In his book he has an interesting table showing that in 1850 England produced nearly seven times more pig iron than Germany; in 1900 she had nearly crept up to England's total; in 1912, only 12 years later, she had passed and doubled it.

OVERSEA INVESTMENTS.—Other evidence is not lacking to explain the change from the outlook of the shopkeeper to that of the usurer. With the slump at home, Capitalism needs a fleet of Dreadnoughts to protect its oversea investments and enforce its claims to new spheres of influence. Sir Robert Giffen estimated our profit on foreign and colonial investments in 1899 at between 90 and 100 millions sterling, and the total is rising rapidly. Mr. Lloyd George estimated in 1915 that the total of our invested capital abroad amounted to £4,000,000,000. Particulars of the extortionate rates charged upon the loans and of the conditions under which capital, in the absence of Factory Acts, is employed abroad make sorry reading. Downing Street and the City work in harmony. Inspired articles in the Press sway public opinion in the absence of any other information, and contributions to the

secret party funds also exercise a hidden influence which helps to complete the unholy alliance between the "concessionaires" and the official heads of the State with the Army and the Fleet at their disposal. *"The disposal of the surplus-product of the modern industrial nations has ceased to be a peaceful matter and become a matter of armed force, actual or potential, used by large groups called Nations. Hence the phenomenon which we call Modern Imperialism."*

As the old supplies of mineral wealth are exhausted the rivalry among the nations to secure the supplies of newer lands is sharpened. Why else should Morocco be desired by France and Germany? For what other reason do Japan, America and the other powers jealously watch each other regarding Siberia? It is not the well-being of the inhabitants of Alsace-Lorraine that is sought, but its coal, its iron, and the other varieties of mineral wealth that it contains. Other lands desired for their mineral and vegetable wealth will occur to the reader's mind upon reflection.

ARMAMENTS AND OFFICE.—Then again, turning to that section of the capitalists who directly profit by furnishing Imperialism its weapons, we find that: "If the pressure of the armament firms can hardly drive a nation into war, it may affect the scale of preparation and set the fashion in costly methods and engines of warfare." That this has been done is common knowledge—thanks to certain able writers, who have, by searching official documents, laid bare the workings of huge international armament trusts and revealed the wires which are pulled to create scares. The Mulliner scare of 1909 is a typical example of the International Octopus which plays upon the fears of men for the sake of profits.

The other minor factor, too, plays a part in the creation of an atmosphere favourable to the growth of Imperialism. When Capitalism was in its pacific mood, one of its spokesmen, Bright, declared his belief in what had been earlier voiced by James Mill, namely, that empire, with its army and navy, was a system of

outdoor relief for the upper classes. The middle class for a long while was not eligible for this preserve of an inefficient aristocracy. The bearing of "the White Man's burden" is a not unprofitable task. Brailsford tells us that: "The annual drain of wealth from India, the indirect tribute which it pays to the ruling class at home, is believed to amount to about *thirty million sterling*, consisting of the interest on capital sunk in India or lent to India, of pensions paid to ex-Anglo-Indians now resident in India." No native Indian is allowed to rise above the rank of subaltern in the Army; the Egyptians are trained to make good clerks.

However, after making these suggestions in reply to the problem which faced us, and leaving them to be followed up and enlarged upon by the student himself, we can pass on to another aspect of this matter.

IV.—The Attitude of the Worker to Imperialism.

When analysing Capitalism to explain its latest mood it was seen that Capitalism must of necessity produce a surplus-product. The cause of the crisis now creates a crisis of another sort—"Iron and steel mean war." Why there is capital to export abroad is because the working class is divorced from the means of production and consequently does not own or control the finished product. *If there was no surplus value produced, there would be no problem arising from the disposal of the surplus-product.* There is a wonderful depth of irony in the fact that the workers are taxed and conscripted because the profits made out of the consumption of their labour-power need the backing of force to make their way into new lands. Not only do they create the profits, but a section of them, decked in special clothing, isolated from their fellows and divided again themselves into various grades, is used to safeguard the consequences of these very misappropriations.

We saw that in practice every worker is forced to face the friction which arises between the employer and himself over the matter of the surplus-product. Without increased productivity wages can only rise

at the expense of profits. But many workers have not as yet consciously thought out, recognised and accepted the theory of this friction or struggle as it arises between class and class; they have not seen that this class-struggle can only be ended by the change of the system and the triumph of their own class and the end of the capitalist class. If our former judgements were sound, Capitalism in its warlike mood caused Imperialism and the consequent wars. Therefore, knowing the true cause, we are alive to the dangers and recognise that the ideals and the aims of the workers, and the aims of the Imperialists, are antagonistic. Hence the attitude of the intelligent worker must be one of resolute opposition, because Imperialism is only a new phase of an old evil. Thanks to the dictatorship the master class exercise over our fellows, many of them are willing to throw themselves and their children beneath the wheels of this modern Juggernaut; but their number is lessening.

Capitalism once promised to become international; but now nationalism crops up again. Once it thought all men and races fit for political liberty and self-government, but now believes in superior and inferior races and nations. The Scientific Socialist knows, however, that *the real difference between the backward and the forward races is only one of technique*. For example, Japan is now no longer considered as one of the decadent races since she has adopted Western methods and tools of production. In all our Industrial History lessons we have seen that evolution has occurred, not through the striving of "Chosen Peoples" to lead more unfortunate peoples, born to be ruled, towards the light, but through the struggle of classes with each other. To quote Boudin:—"The theory of the class-struggle is in absolute and irreconcilable opposition to the nationalistic theory of patriotism—while its practice makes the practice of the patriotic virtues utterly impossible." Howbeit, the humanism, liberalism and ideas of political liberty cherished by Capitalism in its middle period

will be preserved and carried forward by the workers though their former bearer has become reactionary.

Class-consciousness, once developed, will determine the workers' attitude; will protect them from the ravages of war-fever; and save them from being prostituted by patriotism. The alternative, the continuance of the present system, is too horrible to contemplate. As the forces of cohesion and repulsion can be seen in the mighty planet, as well as in the tiny individual speck of matter, so the force of attraction to their own class and of repulsion to the exploiting class will one day be felt by the whole of the world of labour, as well as by the individual worker in his own particular place. The International will then be a reality.

READING:

Gibbins' *History of Commerce*. See Book IV. for the first War-like Period.

For supplementary information:

Boudin's *Socialism and War*. (New York Review, 5s.)

Brailsford's *War of Steel and Gold*. (Bell & Sons, 2s. 6d.)

Newbold's *War Trust Exposed* and *Capitalism and War* (N.L.P., 2d. and 6d.) and

Politics of Capitalism (B.S.P., 3d.) and

Paul's *Labour and Empire* (S.L.P., 3d.).

XX.—IN CONCLUSION

WE can now pause to summarise the whole of our lessons, make a mental stocktaking, and in retrospect retrace our journey—a journey through the long avenue from prehistoric time, “a time when no man knows,” to the known, experienced events of modern days. The evidence accumulated and pieced together by archæologists groping in the past, misty traditions of ancient peoples, and the surer written records of later times have all lent us their aid. Brief references were made to the Stone and Iron Age, the coming of the Aryans east to Europe, of how our own particular country emerged upon the stage of written history with the coming of the Romans, and of how Saxon, Dane, and Norman followed, and finally lost their racial identity in later times. The geologist told us of the struggle between the elements in the earth’s formation. The biologist showed how individual animals and species struggled with each other. And we passed on to sociology and witnessed a struggle still proceeding. In this struggle the new class and the old class were engaged, and of it came the evolution of society. We followed “the chain of change” from mark to manor, from tribal communism to slavery, from slavery to Feudalism, and then onwards to manufacture and machinofacture and our own industrial system. The evolution of the warrior, the merchant, the guildsman, and of the industrial capitalist, with his inevitable companion the wage-worker, has also engaged our attention.

The growth of trade, the division of labour, the rise and fall of handicraft, the division between town and country, the development of the local, the national and (with the discovery of new continents) the world market, the dawn of the new day of science after mediæval night—these and many other things figure upon our Syllabus. The attempts of each rising class to gain political power, the different phases passed

through by Capitalism, the beginning of permanent organisations by our own class, with the success and failure which attended its attempts, all formed subjects for later lessons. We have watched new orders and relations arising out of the old; and have seen that the triumph of each class, as well as its birth, always coincides with the development and progress of material conditions. Every system in its maturity also contained the germs of its own decay. From being a helper the particular system becomes a hinderer. Instead of being revolutionary and a useful aid to production, it becomes reactionary and a useless fetter upon production. Then comes into play the new class which the old has begotten and carries forward the banner of progress. Therefore, using history as a touchstone, and recognising that new ideas, new codes of morality, new laws, etc., have their origin in changing economic conditions, we are now in a position clearly to examine the economic factors at present at work, to act in accordance with their evolution, and take up our stand with the new class in its forward march.

THE LOGIC OF THE MACHINE.—This is a term often used to describe the economic factors which are inherent in capitalist production, and which, as we have seen, especially since the Industrial Revolution, have been compelling the working class to take up arms in its own defence.

Right at the beginning of this book it was shown that man only differed from the animal in his power of tool-making, which of course predicates a corresponding development of the thinking faculty, and this again would be closely connected with a vocal language; tool-making, thinking, and talking being inseparable and correlative in their growth. Man has in common with the animal "the will to live," but he has something else, viz., "the will to live better." Now the economic needs of man for food, clothing and shelter are satisfied by contact with Nature—*i.e.*, the soil, fruit-trees, and all the earth's contents and inhabitants. Moreover, these

bodily needs must be satisfied before he can indulge in art or any other spiritual needs which in later development may be his. Naturally, man tries to satisfy those former needs with the least possible exertion. But he can only continue "to live better" by constantly developing and improving his tools. For here, with the making of the first tool, begins the great gulf between man and the animal. The animal acts directly upon Nature; but man interposes between himself and Nature a tool—an action mighty in its consequences, as we shall see. For example, a dog and a rabbit scratch and burrow the ground with their paws; but man makes a sharpened stick, a spade, and in time a steam plough, and successfully, by means of his tools, honeycombs even the rocks of the earth in search of minerals. The fox jumps for the grapes; but man, as a result of his improved technique, thinks of a ladder. When even the eagle's eye fails to pierce the distance, man's telescope is more successful. Man's power over his natural environment results from this interposition. A fish out of water has become proverbial as an instance of an unsuitability to environment which spells death. Likewise, a bird cannot live under water. But man, with his technique, becomes a fish in his submarine and a bird in his aeroplane. The dense forests are cleared; the jungle inhabited; the ocean spanned; the deserts irrigated; the microbe-infested fever swamps made healthy, and the mountains bored, because man increases his science, harnesses natural forces to do his bidding, and is ever perfecting his tools and machinery.

There is another aspect of the important results of the tool, and that is the consequences arising from its ownership by particular persons. Jack London, in his pamphlet, *The Strength of the Strong*, tells in a simple, picturesque fashion the story of these results. To cut a long story short, it can be said:—*The class of persons owning the tools or the means of production is the ruling class.* In the realm of biology there is a very obvious division of labour based upon physiological grounds—e.g., that of sex. It is impossible for the queen bee,

the worker bee, or the drone to do each other's work. But in sociology, with the coming of tools, a new division of labour, based upon economic grounds arises. It has already been shown that man, unlike the animal, is not physically changed by his environment, but that he is able, by changing and improving his tools, to overcome it. First came a difference between man and man, based upon *tool-using*; in modern life the difference between a miner and an engineer, a painter and a plumber, is in the different tools they use. Physically, a capitalist and a wage-worker, a queen and a washer-woman, are alike. Neither has an arm, an eye, or a leg more than the other. The difference is one of economic position, which is based in this case upon *tool-ownership*. Technique has developed to the extent that a leisured class is possible—*i.e.*, a class which appropriates the surplus labour of another.

The break-up of the tribal community of pauperism, the rise of private property and the State, the division of society into classes, and the use of slaves, have been noted by us previously. Out of slavery came Feudalism. Then, the land was the chief means of production, and as the fighters became its owners, they were the ruling class. Gradually we saw trade and the merchant class increase. From handicraft evolved manufacture. New means of production dwarfed the importance of the land. The old relations were broken down, and a new class rose to power. We witnessed how it asserted its strength upon the economic field first, and then later, in a political revolution, but how the industrial capitalist was never all-powerful until he possessed the machine. The following is a bare enumeration of some of the effects of the operation of its logic. In dealing with the results of the Industrial Revolution we have had occasion to notice them before:—

(1) The machine breaks down all barriers of age, sex, and race. The use of machinery destroyed much of the laborious, heavy work, and thus made possible its performance by women and children. The merciless exploitation of the child slaves of the factory has not yet

faded from our memory; and, though restricted, it has not even now disappeared. The "breaking up of the home"—that anti-Socialist bogey—has already been in many instances accomplished.* While women's entrance into industry may—especially if the male workers do not tackle the problem intelligently—at first have disastrous results, still, if she finally gains economic independence and becomes the true equal and comrade of man, undreamt of beneficial results will accrue.

Again, the possibility of sharing the Imperialist's ideas of there being "superior" and "inferior" peoples is clearly revealed if we recognise that the difference between lesser and more developed peoples, just as between man and the animal, is one of more or less developed technique. One need not be very well versed in world-politics to notice demonstrations of how the capital and commodities of the more advanced countries, by investment and export, beget their like in all the ends of the earth; and of how the so-called backward countries are reproducing the industrial systems of the forward ones, and following practically the same lines of development.

(2) In the wake of the machine comes the crisis, the growth of large production, and the increasing of the rate of exploitation of the worker. There is no need to elaborate these points as they have already been dealt with. They occur as the inevitable outcome of the inherent laws of the capitalist system and were given as the fundamental cause of the Industrial Unrest in Outline XVIII.

(3) Born before the machine, yet made doubly necessary by its coming, Trade Unions commenced striving to retain by collective effort the imperilled status and livelihood of their members. Individual bargaining having failed, workmen formed local trade clubs. From these grew national clubs or unions of each separate trade. These again formed into federations

* See Mary Marcy's leaflet.

and congresses to gain strength. Some attempts were made to form international unions between like trades, and national delegates were appointed at some of the congresses to express the international unity of Labour, which was being already realised.

Our recent lessons have indicated how the logic of the machine has destroyed the craft basis of the older unions by destroying handicraft and introducing unskilled labour—the machine minders and “hands” of modern production. Changing circumstances thus caused the basis, aim and policy of the unions to be revised. *The members of an industry union now aim at controlling industry through their organisations.* Having understood the logic of the machine, they seek to master it. To do this, they have first to shape their own union, control its policy and representatives, and convert their organisation into a fighting machine capable of efficiently waging war on the industrial and political fields.

Before our lesson finishes an endeavour will be made to direct attention to the theoretical weapons already at hand, which will give the worker a clear understanding of his proper aim, and stimulate him to practical work and to solve the question of ways and means to attain that desired end.

THE RISE OF SCIENTIFIC SOCIALISM.—Since we have been discussing the machine and the effects of its private ownership, it is only proper that we should turn to a proposed alternative economic system, the founders of which, for the first time in history, laid bare the forces making for the dissolution of the capitalist system. It has been well said that though the machine has no voice, its victim has one, and that this victim is forced to cry out in protest and cherish ideas of revolt. Another writer has well described Capitalism as being to the worker a chair with spikes in it, which will not allow him to sit content until they are removed. And thus, in spite of conservative forces and the power of tradition, the worker will be forced to face “things as they are” and alter them. “Labour, the Atlas of

the capitalist system, is destined to become its Nemesis."

Socialism is a word which came into general use in the third decade of the 19th century, and it has always been understood to signify a new state of affairs in opposition to Capitalism. The adjective "scientific" is used to distinguish this Socialism from the schemes of those Utopians and Idealist Socialists who based their plans for a new state of affairs upon abstract principles, rather than upon the logic of the machine and the historical growth of society resulting from the friction between rival classes.*

Many great thinkers in the past, dissatisfied with the conditions of their times, had drafted out plans for a re-modelling of affairs. Some of them put their plans into practice and experimented with communal colonies. Plato's *Republic*, More's *Utopia*, Cabet's *Icaria*, St. Simon's *Industrial System*, Fourier's *Phalanstery*, and Robert Owen's *New Moral World* are the best known examples.

Scientific Socialism can only be understood by knowing the conditions of its birth and the experience of its founders. At the close of the 18th century and the beginning of the 19th, society in the two most advanced countries, France and England, was passing through a change. And the Socialism fathered by that change was based, not upon ideals, wishes, or a subjective change in men's heads, but upon the objective processes of society. None of the Utopians saw Socialism as an historic necessity, or recognised the class struggle in which the workers were the true bearers of progress. The real test of Scientific Socialism is that it explains itself; for its theories clearly came out of the material conditions of the times. The French Revolution, "promising the reign of reason, had brought the despotism of the factory." The French section of the capitalist class triumphed, and the feudal nobility were sent packing. But the proletarian element in the

* The Utopian is one who, starting from an abstract principle, seeks for a perfect social organisation."—Plechanoff.

Revolution remained unsatisfied. A new, distinct class could be clearly seen for the first time, for whom the Revolution did not go far enough, and who, in the 19th century, made many revolts against the bourgeoisie. In England, too, a revolution of another sort was taking place. The rapid introduction of machinofacture revolutionised the old methods of production and caused immense misery among the working class, making it feel and express its antagonism to the capitalists here also. To explain these new social facts, new theories were required, and these theories were expressed most clearly by Marx and Engels, the acknowledged founders of Scientific Socialism. As these men happened to be born in Germany, their theories are sometimes dismissed as being "foreign" by people (e.g., the Fabians) who claim to have distinctly British (!) economic theories. As if there was anything *national* about a scientific theory or as if Socialism was determined by geography! The foolishness of the objection becomes more apparent when it is realised that the 40 years of research embodied in *Capital* were spent in England, the classic land of Capitalism. Owing to Germany's then backward state, the conclusions could never have been arrived at there.

Marx was born in 1818 at Trèves. He studied law, history, and philosophy at the Bonn and Berlin universities. His Radical opinions spoiled his chance of appointment as lecturer on philosophy at the former, and he became editor of the *Rhenish Gazette* in 1842. This being suppressed, he went to Paris in 1843. Here he met Proudhon and Heine, and began his famous collaboration with Frederick Engels. Being expelled from France, he resided in Brussels. With Engels he produced, in 1848, the famous *Communist Manifesto*. After the failure of the uprisings in the same year, he finally settled in London in 1849, and, after writing the 1st vol. of *Capital* and making the notes for the 2nd and 3rd as well as being active in political matters and in the International, died there in 1883. Overwork undoubtedly hastened the end of this great life.

Engels (1820-95) was the son of a wealthy cotton spinner and was destined for a commercial career. But he, too, became interested in philosophy, and contributed to the *Rhenish Gazette*. In 1842 he came to Manchester and became connected with the Owenite and Chartist movements. After 1844, he and Marx were in constant touch with each other, and their work became inseparable. Engels, with becoming humility, always gave Marx the chief credit, as the following passage written by him at the death of Marx shows:—"I cannot grasp the thought that this genius should have ceased to fertilise with his powerful thoughts the proletarian movement of both worlds. Whatever we all are, we are through him; and whatever the movement of to-day is, it is through his theoretical and practical work; without him we should still be stuck in the mire of confusion." Alone, either of these men would have made a mark. Combined, they left behind them works whose true insight and value have not yet been fully appreciated.

The poverty and sorrows of Marx, of his family, and of his fellow-exiles, his activities in the formation of the first International—for neither Marx nor Engels were closet philosophers—his herculean theoretic labours, his disdain of popularity, his hatred of phrasemongery, and his many other distinguishing traits may be read of in the biographies which exist. As Wilhelm Liebknecht put it:—

To-day Marx's *Capital* dominates social and political science, like Darwin's works in the science of natural history. And there is no thinking proletarian in all the countries of the globe who does not know that *Capital* is an armoury filled with "mental weapons" that, wielded by the proletariat, will ensure its emancipation.

The same writer, in the same book, *Karl Marx: Biographical Memoirs*, wrote:—

On *Capital* he was at work 40 years—and how he did work! Only a Marx can work so. And I am not exaggerating when I say: The worst paid day-labourer in Germany has received more wages in 40 years than Marx did for a salary, as an

honorary fee, for one of the two greatest scientific creations of the century. The other one is represented by Darwin's works.

"Science" is not a market value. And can we expect that human society would pay a decent price for the execution of its own death warrant?

Liebknecht for 12 years shared Marx's exile in London, and the following is a glimpse of how they spent their time:—

About this time the magnificent reading-room of the British Museum, with its inexhaustible treasures of books, had been built—and thither, where he passed a certain time every day, Marx drove us. To learn! To learn! This was the categorical Imperative he frequently enough loudly shouted to us, but it also was expressed by his example, yea, by the sole aspect of this forever strenuously working mind.

Here he mentions the wild plans and hopes of other fugitives, and in contrast to this he says:—

We . . . were sitting in the British Museum and trying to educate ourselves and to prepare arms and ammunition for the battles of the future. Sometimes we would not have had a bite, but that would not prevent our going to the Museum—there were at least comfortable chairs to sit down on, and in winter a cheering warmth—which were missing at home, if one had any "house" or "home" at all.

THE MARXIAN THEORIES.—From the men to their message. The Marxian Theories can be well compared to a triangle, with the Labour Theory of Value, the Theory of Surplus Value, and the Materialist Conception of History as its three sides. In our lessons, we have had chiefly to do with the latter, though the two former are bound up with it, and would also repay investigation and test. The M.C.H. was first formulated in the *Communist Manifesto*:—"The history of all hitherto existing society (*i.e.*, all written history) is the history of class struggles." And in later works the theory was enlarged and applied to the history of different nations. The historic mission of the working class, the true nature of the State, and the real, underlying factor beneath all changes in ideas were roughly perceived even when the *Manifesto* was penned in

1848. "History for the first time," wrote Engels, "was placed on its real foundation; the obvious fact, hitherto totally neglected, that first of all men must eat, drink, have shelter and clothing, and therefore must work before they can struggle for supremacy and devote themselves to politics, religion, philosophy, etc.—this obvious fact at last found historical recognition."

As we have already dealt with the logic of the machine, and seen how social relations are based upon tool-ownership and that the class which owns the tools is very different from the other class that is forced to use those tools in order to get a living—besides having consistently used this theory right throughout our lessons—there is no need to dwell upon it further. Though the expectations and prophecies of the historic *Manifesto* were not fulfilled, yet the theory explains in a scientific manner its own mistakes, and, as a method of looking upon society and explaining its evolution, it is unparalleled.

There is one other matter that should be mentioned before our conclusion. When giving particulars concerning the lives of Marx and Engels, we found that both took up the study of philosophy, in which branch of learning at that time Hegel was the leading figure. It is sometimes alleged that the work of Marx is vitiated by this Hegelian influence, and that he lacked the insight into society which Darwinism later brought. Apart from this mixing up, in an "organic" view of society, of biology and sociology, this misconception of Hegelianism (for it taught evolution in general before Darwin gave it individual specific proof in biology) and this false assumption that Marx did not know and appreciate Darwin's work, there is also a sad neglect of the vital difference between the philosophy of Hegel and Historical Materialism.

There is room here only for a brief reference to that difference. Hegel, living in revolutionary times, with his "dialectic method" saw movement through inherent struggle. But he was misled by the ideological

form which the contest took. To him it was "the Absolute Idea" coming to recognition in the minds of men. For example, Feudalism broke down because feudal ideas became obsolete in the face of new; Socialism from the Hegelian viewpoint will come because old ideas are displaced by new. In later reactionary times Hegel's tame political conclusions and his glorification of the State made him popular with the ruling powers. Bernstein, in his *Ferdinand Lassalle as Social Reformer* shows how the works of Lassalle—"the man who forged the sword of Social Democracy in Germany"—were vitiated by his adherence to the Hegelian "idea" as a cause of progress.

The mysticism of Hegel and his "Absolute Idea" were attacked by the left wing of his school, which accepted his dialectic method but rejected his conclusions. With Hegel the world stood on its head—*i.e.*, on the idea. Marx stood it on its feet, and showed that ideas were generated in material conditions. "With me," wrote he (p. xxx, *Capital*), "the ideal is nothing else than the material world reflected by the human mind and transformed into forms of thought." The relations between ideas and the conditions which generate them are more fully explained in the Preface of *The Critique* (1859).

THE FUTURE.—What of it? Will our lessons help us to face it? Shall we be able to act with a confidence and courage based on a knowledge of our true position? If our studies do not so help us they have failed. Their sole object is to get a knowledge of past events and of theories which truly explain the facts of our working life, and which will guide us in future practice. Knowledge is Power—in our case—power to end wage-slavery. The C.L.C. was founded in 1909 out of the most unique strike on record.* It aims at spreading independent working-class education, and upon its curriculum figure the truths

* See *Plebs Magazine*, (Vol. I.) and *What Does Education Mean to the Worker?* (*Plebs Pamphlet* 1½d.)

arrived at by these two German thinkers, who gave themselves so wholeheartedly and "whole-headedly" to the workers' cause. As W. W. Craik finely puts it: "The good they did was not interred with the bones of Marx at Highgate, nor lost in the sea into which the dust of Engels was thrown, but lives on and fertilises in the conquering army of an intellectual Labour Movement, by the side of whose cradle Marx and Engels stood at the dawn of a new day." The classes springing up everywhere studying and applying their theories are effecting a vast change in the outlook and policy of the Labour Movement, and their potentiality is immeasurable.

Vain are the hopes of an industrial peace. Like snow upon the mountain side they will vanish before the sun of economic heat. In every country Capitalism begets its gravediggers. In its endeavour to increase its profits it will force the workers to take up a militant attitude upon the industrial, political and educational fields, and progress will be accelerated until the workers of the world will unite to accomplish their emancipation. To the Day!

BOOKS:

Liebknecht's *Karl Marx: Biographical Memoirs*. (Kerr, 2s. 6d.) Spargo's *Karl Marx* (National Labour Press, 8s. 6d.) This book cannot be regarded as very reliable, and Kautsky and Mehring have severely castigated it. The late Mehring wrote a biography which so far is not translated. Books and pamphlets by Marx and Engels are too numerous to list, and are obtainable at cheap rates from the S.L.P., B.S.P., and Kerr.

Ramsay Macdonald's *Socialism and Society* (I.L.P., 2s.), and *The Socialist Movement* (Williams and Norgate, 2s.) contain good accounts of the Utopians, though somewhat spoilt by the "organic" view of society above-mentioned. Other general and particular histories of Socialism are available.

EPILOGUE

IT is extremely difficult to summarise the many movements of the last 10 years, so rapidly has the rate of progress been accelerated. History is being made faster than it can be chronicled. In every country important events and happenings have been crammed into very short periods. The tide of affairs has been, and is actually now, sweeping fast and far. Moreover, history is judgement, and to make judgements of lasting value upon movements and events while in their midst is a difficult matter. Local details and present occurrences make difficult the obtaining of a true perspective. But despite all this, aided by a knowledge of the past, even now a broad shaping of events can be traced. The outlines in the picture can be appreciated if much of the full detail is indistinct and undeveloped.

As forecasted, Industrial Unrest still continues. The $2\frac{1}{2}$ millions of Trade Unionists of 1910 have grown to over $5\frac{1}{4}$ millions in 1919. The newspapers day by day reveal a world in ferment; from every land comes news of agitations and strikes. Here the situation is complicated by problems of race and nationality, and there the demands seem somewhat incoherent and trifling. Divisions of opinion over rival tactics seem to obscure important issues. But everywhere is change, movement, a becoming. At the present moment 70 strikes, large and small, are proceeding in the United States, only eight of which have received official sanction from the leaders of the American Federation of Labour; and the powers of the State are being used to break strikes there just as they have recently been used here. In the current number of the *Esperantista Laboristo* are reports of labour movements in France practically identical with our own. The same social problems and solutions are to be found in Germany, Italy and the other countries alike. An ogre is haunting the world. The mentality inevitably created by Capitalism, and increasingly

hastened in its growth by the consequences of world war and working-class propaganda and action, is the greatest factor in hindering the increased production which is needed by our masters to make good the credit given and to back the over-issued paper money of a disturbed capitalist world.

There is also a noticeable change coming over both the statement of wrongs and the demands for redress of the working class. Certainly many disputes still, and will, occur over wages and hours. Often the standard of life of the worker is in danger of being undermined by the increased cost of living, and that standard of life is irresistibly going to be improved by the might of organised labour rather than by the former appeals to an apathetic, shapeless and ineffective "public opinion" for sympathy. But, in addition, is coming a revolt against the dictatorship of the master class in affairs big and little. To illustrate from a modern happening: The newspaper compositors may be comparatively well paid, yet that will not prevent them from refusing to allow their labour to be the means to defame their fellow workers of another industry who happen to be on strike. The mental horizon is being widened, from wages and hours disputes, to a knowledge of the uses to which the result of labour is being put, and of the indignity which lack of control both of the tools and the product spell to the wage-slave. Under these circumstances the path of the National Alliance of Employers and Employed will be difficult and thorny.

It is only natural, then, that the thinking influential minority is busy thinking out the practical details of control. [For such an attempt in the mining industry see *Industrial Democracy for the Mining Industry*, 3d.] Nationalisation of industry, now being brought into prominence by the agitation of the organised miners, is now inseparable from workers' control. The advisers to the workers, the intellectuals, sensible to this change, now speak of "functional democracy" and "stratified democracy," instead of the former collec-

tivism. What transition stages that control will pass through is hard to exactly say. The workers' share of control will be determined by their effective desire and readiness for it. The application of the idea will have to be the task of the workers of every grade and every department actually engaged in the industry; they again relating themselves to the workers of other industries who also have studied their own particular problems. Society is undoubtedly undergoing a re-grouping, out of which the producers' industrial organisations will appear more clearly than before as the administrative framework of the future society. Kinship and locality ties are being succeeded by industrial. The old geographical political basis of society asking Where do you live? is being replaced by a newer industrial administrative basis asking Where do you work? It is now very obvious to all that the workers cannot capture existing political institutions and use them unaltered for their own purposes, but are bringing with them new forms of organisation.

One of the most significant happenings born out of the Industrial Unrest was the Triple Alliance, the formation of which was begun in 1914 by a joint committee of the Miners' Federation of Great Britain, the National Union of Railwaymen, and the Transport Workers' Federation. On several important occasions it has made its influence felt, though it is such a powerful weapon that many of its rank and file constituent members and the men at its head hesitate to use it. The purpose of the Alliance, contrary to that of the General Federation of Trade Unions, is mutual help, not by financial aid in prolonged sectional strikes, but by large scale action. Two out of the three Unions have distinctly adopted the industry basis of organisation, and, if the Triple Alliance is going to fulfil the hopes of its originators, this basis will have to be emphasised and more clearly appreciated than now. At the time of writing an endeavour is being made to more closely connect railway transport organisation with other kinds of transport. Regarding the Triple

Alliance as a nucleus of an organisation which can be made capable to take and to control the means of production, the unions inside each industry must settle their internal differences before becoming part of the larger body. If this condition is not enforced the Triple Alliance will become a mixed assembly without any plan or order, and will repeat the failings of other bodies with, perhaps, a little more militant outlook and policy.

There have been more propagandist bodies started since those mentioned in the 17th Outline. Each has emphasised a certain point of view and particular tactics, and voiced principles of ultimate worth if, in some cases, not now expedient. However, the sectarianism usually banefully possessed by propagandist parties is being considerably weakened. This is probably due to the shaking up all movements have received by the rapid developments of the past five years which have helped them to realise their supplementary function to the organised Labour Movement. In some parts of Britain a new propaganda unit has appeared which is in close touch, and sometimes synonymous, with the important Shops Committee movement. What this is going to mean, whether it will be able to amalgamate and transform the rival craft unions on the workshop basis, or whether it will always work from the outside, remains yet to be fully seen. Amalgamation is proceeding, but not sufficiently quickly in view of the urgency of the situation.

To look farther afield. Subsequent happenings have so confirmed what was written about the causes of Imperialism that no further comment is needed, Its opponents need say no more. Another never-to-be-forgotten event, world-wide in its influence, has been the happenings in Russia during the past two years. The dust and smoke still hover thick over the attempts now being so bravely made to establish there a Socialist Republic; and to do that in the face of ruthless opposition and repeated attack from the Imperialists, added to the apathy and lack of supporting action from the

majority of the European workers. What compromises circumstances—lack of machinery and technical skill and backward industrial organisation—have compelled the Soviet administration to make are not clear. How long before it will be able to dispense with its temporary dictatorship is difficult to tell. Whether the circumstances of Russia will to any great extent be repeated here and elsewhere is again a question which only time will answer, and that after we all have thought, answered and acted to the best of our ability. At any rate, there can be seen in the Soviet system of workshop control what we here and elsewhere are approaching more slowly and steadily. If Russia is made a second Hungary it will be to our undying shame, for we can make the Third International, defying, as it is, the opposition of the capitalist League of Nations, such a reality that it will inaugurate a new historical epoch.



I N D E X

ACCUMULATION, Methods of, 62
Alexandria and Science, 72
Apprentice Limit, Removal of, 101, 126
Arabs, 57
Archæological Classification, 12
A.S.E., Formation of, 131
A.S.R.S., 133

BALL, *John, The Dream of*, 54
Barbarism, 13
Bell's Printing Cylinder, 110
Biologic Period, 11
Black Death, The, 52
Blanketeers, March of, 104
Bright, John, and Factory Acts, 121
Buckle, 5

CABOT'S Voyage, 60
Canals, 113
Capital, Definition of, 64
Capitalism, 37, 79
Carlyle, 3
Cartwright's Power Loom, 110
Celts, 14
Chartist Movement, 123
Civil War, The, 90
Coalmining, 111
Columbus, 60, 151
Combination Acts, 103, 104
Commerce, Early Articles of, 39
Commercial Wars, 85, 151
Commutation, 48

Co-operative Movement, 124
Corn Bounties, 93
Crises, 119
Crompton's Mule, 110

DARK Ages, Description of, 71
Domesday Book, 24

ENCLOSURES, 49, 67, 92
Engels, Frederick, 5, *His Conditions*, 117, 171
England's Early Inhabitants, 14
Epochs of Time, 10
Ethnological Classification, 13

FACTORY Acts, 121
Feudalism, 22
Fixed Wage Fund, 130
France, Anatole, 62

GAMA, Vasco da, 60, 151
Geologic Period, 10
Golden Age of Labour, 54
Great Man Theory, 3
Greek Thought, 71
Guilds, 41-47
Guilds, Handicraftsmen of, 29

HANDICRAFTSMEN, Assembling of, 96
Hanseatic League, 35, 60
Hargreaves' Spinning Jenny, 110
Hiawatha, 19
Huguenots, 59, 81

IMPERIALISM, Cause of, 156
Industrial History Defined, 1
Industrial Revolution, 106
Industrial Revolution, Its effects upon Workers, 116
Iron Mining, 111
Italian Towns, 58
Italian Towns and Crusades, 50

JEWES, 57
Journeyman Associations, 47, 95
Junta, The, 132

KAY'S Flying Shuttle, 109
Kett Revolt, 68

LABOUR Party, The, 140
Labour Unrest, 142
Labour of Women and Children, 117
Law of Parochial Settlement, 69
Liebknecht and Marx, 171
Lightfoot, Dr., Estimate of, 10
Locke, John, 60
Logic of the Machine, 163

MACHINE, Competition of, 116
Machine, Stages of, 107
Machine and Tool Defined, 107
Machine-made Machinery, 112
Machinery and Textiles, 109
Machinofacture, 82
Magna Charta, 59, 87
Manor, Anglo-Saxon, The, 19
Manufactory, 81
Manufacture, 96

Mark, The, 15
Markets, Wars for, 85, 151
Marx, 5
Marx, Life of, 170
Marxian Theories, 172
Maudsly's Slide Rest, 112
M.C.H., 5, 7, 172
Merchant Class, Rise of, 56
Merchants, Early, 56
M.F.G.B., 131, 143
Minimum Wage Strike, 143
Monarchy, 87
Monasteries, Confiscation of, 66
Money, Need for, 39
Morality, New, 94
Morality, Tribal, 35
Morgan, Lewis H., 13

NASMYTH and Machinery, 121
Norman Conquest, 24
Northmen, The, 22
Nottingham Lace-making Frames, 126

OSBORNE Judgement, 141
Owen, G.N.C. Union of, 128
Owen, Robert, 127

PARLIAMENT, Formation of, 88
Peasants' Revolt, 53
Phœnicians, 57
Place, Francis, 104
Political Government, Future of, 92
Political Power, Use of, 87
Prices in the 16th Century, 67, 126
Production, Guild and Domestic, 80
Proletariat, Creation of, 64
Proletariat, Defined, 64

Proletariat, Necessity of, 64
Propagandist Bodies, 136, 179
Puritanism, 90

REASONING—New Methods, 75
Reform, Bills of, 1832, 123; 1867 and 1884, 133
Renaissance, Meanings of, 76
Road Improvements, 113
Rogers, Thorold, 54, 126
Roman Occupation, 15

SAVAGERY, 13
Scientific Socialism, 78, 168
Serf, 29
Shifting of Industrial Centres, 111
Skill, Destruction of, 117, 168
Slavery (Chattel), 27
Slide Rest, 112
Smelting, 111
Smith, Adam, 37, 152
Smith, Adam, and Conspiracy, 102
Sociologic Period, 11
Spain, The Ruin of, 61
Spain, Wars Against, 60, 85, 151
State, The, Defined, 87, Use of, 93; end of, 93
Statutes, of Apprentices, 69
Statutes, of Labourers, 52
Steam-power, 109
Surplus Value, 89
S.W.M.F., 131, 137

TAFF Vale Judgement, 141
Taxation, Effects of, 146
Taxes Attacked, 37
Theistic Conception, 3
Theory, Definition, Use and Proof of, 1
Tool Using, 12; and Ownership, 165

Tory Party, The, 91
Towns, Origin of, 37
Trade Effects, 35
Trade Unions:
 Beginnings of, 95
 From 1830 to 1900, 126
 Future of, 148
Trades Councils, 131
Trades Union Congress, 133
Triple Alliance, The, 178

UNIONS, "Model" 129
Ure, Dr., and Machine Improvement, 117
Ure, Dr., and "Order," 101
Utopias, 169

VAGRANCY, 68
Value, Labour Theory of, 65, 172
Value, Labour Theory of, and Gold, 146
Venetian Fleet, The, 58, 60

WAGE Proclamations, 52
Wages, Real and Relative, 147
Wage-worker, The, 31
War, Causes of, 156
War, External and Internal, 50
War, New Methods of, 51
Watt's Steam Engine, 109
W.E.A., 145
Whig Party, The, 91
Whitney's Cotton Gin, 110
Wool, Export of, 49
Wool-growing, Increase of, 67
Working-day, Reduction of, 121

YELLOW Peril, 32

OTHER PUBLICATIONS OF THE
P L E B S L E A G U E

EASY OUTLINES
OF ECONOMICS

By NOAH ABLETT.

1s. 3d. net. Post paid, 1s. 5d. Per 12, 13s.; per 25,
£1 5s.

A SHORT HISTORY OF THE MODERN
BRITISH WORKING-CLASS
MOVEMENT

By W. W. CRAIK.

1s. 6d. net. Post paid, 1s. 8d. Per 12, 16s.; per 25,
£1 10s.

MONTHLY

THREEPENCE

T H E P L E B S

A Review for Working-Class Students.

Articles on historical and current questions; reviews of books; study outlines; correspondence, &c.; written from *the working-class point of view*.

The writers of the above-named books and the author of this volume contribute regularly to the PLEBS, which was founded over eleven years ago to voice the need for Independent Working-Class Education.

Annual postal subscription, 3s. 6d.; six months, 1s. 9d.

THE PLEBS LEAGUE, 11A PENYWERN
ROAD, EARL'S COURT, LONDON, S.W.5

THE PELICAN PRESS



2 CARMELITE ST., E.C.



